
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 September 2016

by **C L Humphrey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22nd September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/16/3152949

162 - 164 Sutton Court Road, Chiswick, London W4 3HR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Steve Jewson and Mr Mahendra Tilakasiri Iddamalgoda against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01091/162-164/P1, dated 25 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 March 2016.
 - The development proposed was originally described as "This is a joint application for side roof dormer extensions for No. 162 and 164 Sutton Court Road and for No 162 a rear roof dormer extension with roof light on front roof slope".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of side roof extensions to both No 162 and 164 with roof windows to front elevations and a rear roof extension to No 162 at 162 - 164 Sutton Court Road, Chiswick, London W4 3HR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 01091/162-164/P1, dated 25 January 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1505-LP Rev. A, 1508-EX10, 1508-EX11, 1508-PA10, 1508-PA11 and 1508-PA12.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. Notwithstanding the description of development set out in the banner heading above, which is taken from the application form, the Council's decision notice describes the development as "Erection of side roof extensions to both No 162 and 164 with roof windows to front elevations and a rear roof extension to No 162", and I note that the appellant has used this description on the appeal form. The revised description more precisely describes the proposed development. Therefore, I have considered the appeal on that basis.
-

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the appeal properties and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal properties are a pair of 2 storey semi-detached houses situated on the north-east side of Sutton Court Road at the western periphery of the Chiswick House Conservation Area (the "Conservation Area").
5. The Chiswick House Conservation Area Appraisal states that the primary architectural and historic interest of the Conservation Area rests with Chiswick House and its landscaped grounds. It goes on to say that the Conservation Area was designated primarily to protect views into and out of this 18th century landscape, and influences the care required to retain the quality of the surrounding streets.
6. Sutton Court Road has a predominantly residential character, featuring detached, semi-detached and terraced houses of various architectural styles from the Victorian and early 20th century period. The appeal properties form part of a group of 5 pairs of semi-detached houses of a similar character and appearance.
7. The proposed dormers to the side would be positioned in the centre of the roof faces, finish below the ridge line and set above the eaves level. They would be separate from the front and rear faces of the roof. The dormers would feature hipped roofs at the same angle as the main roof slope. The proposed design of the windows and use of clay roofing tiles would reflect the existing fenestration and materials of the appeal properties.
8. Accordingly, the proposed side dormer extensions would be secondary to the size of the roof faces within which they would be set, would not harm the profile of the original roofs or the proportions of the houses and would be in keeping with the architectural style of the appeal properties. Therefore, the proposed development would not appear out of scale or overly dominant.
9. Although the appeal proposal relates to a joint application by the occupants of Nos 162 and 164, there is no mechanism before me to ensure that the development is fully implemented. However, even if the development were not carried out in full, the subservient nature of the proposed side dormer extensions would prevent any unduly unbalancing effect upon the pair of semi-detached houses.
10. Of the 10 houses in the group within which the appeal site is located, the roofs of all but the appeal properties and 180 Sutton Court Road have been extended to the side in the form of either dormers or 2 storey side extensions. In that context, the proposed side dormer extensions would not appear out of place, and would reflect the established built form in the immediate vicinity.
11. The appeal properties are located on a bend in the road and so the side elevation of No 162 in particular is visible when viewed from the north, rising above the neighbouring lower building at 160 Sutton Court Road. However, the subordinate scale, sympathetic design and matching materials of the proposed development would ensure that it did not appear to be overly prominent.

12. The proposed flat roofed rear dormer to No 162 would be set down from the ridge line, set up from the eaves and set in from both sides of the rear roof face. It would align with the first floor window below and the fenestration and materials would reflect the existing property. Accordingly, it would be a proportionate and sensitive addition.
13. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the appeal properties or the surrounding area. Furthermore, for the same reasons, I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Chiswick House Conservation Area.
14. As such, the proposed development would accord with the design and heritage conservation and enhancement aims of Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan. The development would also accord with the design objectives set out in Sections 5.0 and 8.0 of the London Borough of Hounslow Supplementary Planning Guidance Residential Extensions Guidelines.

Conditions

15. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. In order to ensure the suitable appearance of the development, I have imposed a condition relating to materials.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C L Humphrey

INSPECTOR