
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2017

by Stephen Normington BSc DipTP MRICS MRTPI FIQ FIHE

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

Decision date: 22 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/16/3163935
12 Brougham Road, Acton, London W3 6JD

- 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 & Mrs T Holland against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 163026HH, dated 17 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is raising the ridge height of roof to accommodate loft conversion with dormer to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for raising of ridge height for rear roof extension (involving conversion of roof into habitable use) and installation of three roof lights to front roof slope at 12 Brougham Road, Acton, London W3 6JD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 163026HH, dated 17 June 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: 100 – Site Location Plan; 101 – Existing Layout and Elevations; 102 – Proposed Layout and Elevations; 103 – Existing and Proposed Street Scene.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details/samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension and roof hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details/samples.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council altered the description of the development of application ref: 163026HH to "raising of ridge height for rear roof extension (involving conversion of roof into habitable use) and installation of three roof lights to front roof slope." This description more adequately reflects the development proposed and is more precise than that given on the application form. Consequently, I have referred to the Council's amended description in this decision.
-

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises bay fronted, two storey semi-detached dwelling located on Brougham Road which is a residential street that rises from west to east and comprises predominantly of semi-detached bay fronted dwellings of various architectural styles with considerable variance in roof height. The adjacent properties forming the pair of semi-detached dwellings at Nos 14 and 16 have a roof height that is considerably higher than that of the appeal property. At my site visit I observed that several properties in the vicinity have had the height of the roof raised in order to accommodate rear dormer extensions.
5. The proposed development would involve a modest increase in the height of the roof by approximately 0.32m and the insertion of three roof lights on the front slope. The roofs of properties on the street step up in correlation with the gradient of the road. In my view, the increase in the height of the roof would appear as an acceptable transition between No 10 and the dominant height of the roof at No 14. It would also be reflective of the increasing height of roofs that step up to correlate with the slope of the street.
6. Given that the proposed roof would appear as a transition between No 10 and No14, I do not consider that the balance or symmetry of the block of semis occupied by the appeal property would be unacceptably harmed. The proposed roof lights would have no material impact on the character of the street which has numerous examples of roof lights on the front roof slope. Taking these factors into account, I do not consider that the proposed modest increase in the height of the roof would cause any harm to the character and appearance of the Brougham Road street scene.
7. The proposal also provides for a rear dormer extension that would extend to the height of the raised roof and would occupy the full extent of the roof slope. At my site visit I observed a variety of rear roof extensions already exist in the immediate locality, including the adjoined semi at No 10. Several of these, on both Brougham Road and Faraday Road have rear dormer extensions that occupy the full extent of the rear roof slope, some of which are visible from the rear garden of the appeal property. Overall, the rear of properties in the area display a wide variety of rear roof extensions in scale, design and materials.
8. A characteristic feature of the area is that the rear gardens are relatively short which results in the rear of the properties being tightly grouped. As a consequence the rear of the appeal property is relatively enclosed by the rear of properties on Faraday Road and the substantial three storey apartment block located on the junction of Brougham Road and Horn Lane such that views of the rear of the appeal property are only readily attainable from the rear gardens and properties on Faraday Road.
9. In this case, I have taken into account the enclosed nature of the site, the limitation in public view and the existence of similarly sized rear dormer extensions in relatively close proximity to the appeal property. These factors are material considerations which, in combination, are of sufficient weight to

outweigh the related guidance in the adopted Supplementary Planning Document 4 – Residential Extensions (SPD) and suggest that the scale and mass of the proposed rear dormer would not cause any unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area.

10. In addition, given the presence of existing rear dormer at No 10, I do not consider that the proposed dormer would unacceptably unbalance the existing pair of semis. To some extent the proposed development would redress some of the imbalance to this pair of properties that results from the presence of the existing rear dormer at No 10.
11. I have taken into account the Council's concerns regarding the proposed use of dark grey metal cladding and contemporary fenestration. However, I agree with the appellant that there are several examples in the area where dark grey metal cladding has been used and that proposed fenestration would be reflective of that used in the existing ground floor rear extension. Taking these factors into account and the enclosed nature of the site, I do not consider that the proposed fenestration and materials would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area of an extent to warrant the dismissal of this appeal.
12. I recognise that this proposal is larger than the examples provided in the SPD. However, given the locational and design factors in this case, I consider that the appeal proposal constitutes the circumstance where a larger dormer would be acceptable.
13. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would not therefore conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Plan Document (2013) and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan. These policies, amongst other things, require that development should have regard to the scale, mass and design of adjacent buildings and of detail and materials that compliment, not necessarily replicate, local architectural character.
14. The Council has also referred to conflict with Policies 1.1(g), 2.1(c) and 2.10 of the Ealing Development Strategy (2013). However, these policies are of a strategic nature relating to transportation matters and regeneration of the Uxbridge Road Cross Rail Corridor. I consider that these have little relevance to the appeal proposal. As such I have attached little weight to their provisions.

Conditions

15. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I consider it necessary to impose a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interest of certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition concerning the external materials to be used.

Conclusion

16. For the above reasons, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Stephen Normington

INSPECTOR