The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2016

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 12 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/16/3158550
43 Graham Road, Chiswick, W4 5DR

- 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 A Jarman against the decision of the Council of the London
- Borough of Ealing.
- The application Ref 161881HH, dated 28 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 June 2016.
- The development proposed is loft conversion.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft conversion at 43 Graham Road, Chiswick, W4 5DR in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 161881HH, dated 28 April 2016, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 location plan, 1:500 block plan, 01, 02, 03, 04, 05 and 06.

   3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 43 Graham Road is a two storey semi-detached house in an established residential area. The street as a whole is characterised by similar houses of brick and painted render with gabled two storey front bays.

4. Policies relevant in this appeal include 7.4 and 7.6 of the Consolidated London Plan 2015, 1.1(g), 2.1(c) and 2.10 of the Ealing Development Strategy Development Plan Document 2012 (the DSDPD) and 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document 2013 (the DMDPD). These require new development to be of a high quality of design appropriate to

its context, to complement the scale and building pattern of the area and to protect local character.

5. The proposed loft conversion includes the alteration of the main roof from a side hip to a gable at the same height as the existing ridge and a flat roofed extension towards the rear at roof level to provide two bedrooms and a bathroom. I consider that, although the development would be large, it would not appear unduly out of scale with the existing building or the surroundings.

6. I saw during my visit that a large majority of the properties in Graham Road have main roofs which seem to have been converted from hipped to gabled and this is now a characteristic feature of the area. Several properties appear to have extensions at roof level similar to that proposed here.

7. No. 43 is located on a bend in the road and therefore its side elevation is more exposed to view than those of the other altered houses in the street. However, it is partially obscured by a new two storey house, No. 43B, which itself has a slightly unconventional configuration to its side elevations and at roof level, perhaps to accommodate the constraints of the site.

8. The proposed gable end of No. 43 would only be visible from a narrow viewpoint at street level where it would appear similar to that of others in the street. The extension would be barely visible from the street from the west because it would be behind the new gable itself and would be obscured by No. 43B.

9. I have viewed the examples of other roof conversions and extensions which have been brought to my attention. I do not consider that the large extension at 1B Graham Road is necessarily a good example to follow because of its materials and boxy nature. On the other hand, I find the numerous examples in the rest of Graham Road which are similar to the appeal proposal are acceptable in the context and are now an established form to the point of being part of the characteristic pattern of development in the immediate area.

10. I conclude that the proposal would not be overdevelopment of the site and that it would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the house itself or the wider area. In this respect it would be consistent with policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, 1.1(g), 2.1(c) and 2.10 of the DSDPD and 7.4 and 7B of the DMDPD.

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework. A condition detailing the plans is necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt. The condition relating to the materials is necessary to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR