

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2017

by **R J Maile BSc FRICS**

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

Decision date: 13 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/17/3167949
44 Eccleston Road, London, W13 0RL.

- 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 Edward Botcherby against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application ref: 165828/HH, dated 14 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion and additional bedroom at the rear of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft conversion and additional bedroom at the rear of the property at 44 Eccleston Road, London, W13 0RL, in accordance with the terms of the application ref: 165828/HH, dated 14 November 2016, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Block Plan:	scale 1:500.
Drawing no. 01 Rev B:	Existing Plans and Elevations – scale 1:50.
Drawing no. 01 Rev A:	Proposed Plans and Elevations – scale 1:50.

Main Issue

2. The main issue here is the effect of the proposed alterations and extension upon the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area.
-

Reasons

3. 44 Eccleston Road forms one of a terrace of Victorian houses located in a mixed residential area. The site is not within a Conservation Area or Area of Special Residential Character.
4. To the rear of no. 44, but separated from the back garden by a high brick wall is Hanwell Cemetery, which is a designated Conservation Area. I am nevertheless satisfied, given the distance of the rear elevation of the property from the designated area and the intervening high brick wall, that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would remain unaffected by the scheme before me.
5. The proposed rear dormer would be full width and occupy the entire area of the main rear roof slope. In this regard, I note the advice in the Officer's Report that the dormer should be set down from the ridge line and the side of the roof by 0.5m and should be located above the eaves by a similar amount.
6. Whilst I have sympathy with these comments, my decision to allow this appeal is influenced by the full height dormers to 40 and 42 Eccleston Road next door and those which I noted at 52 and 66 Eccleston Road, photographs of which have been provided to me. Furthermore, any reduction in height of the dormer would be at odds with the full height dormers next door and create cramped loft accommodation, with a reduced ceiling height.
7. In terms of the proposed extension over an existing two storey outrigger, I am also influenced by the alterations to nos. 40 and 42 and by the existence of a substantial party wall separating this element of the scheme from no. 46 to the north.
8. Other than the three roof lights to the front roof slope the extensions would be completely screened in views from Eccleston Road.
9. For all of these reasons I find upon the main issue that the proposed alterations and extension are acceptable in terms of their impact upon the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area, as required by Chapter 7 (Requiring good design) of the Framework¹, Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan and Policies 7A and 7B of the DPD².

Conditions

10. I have considered the three conditions put forward by the Council against the tests of the Framework and advice provided by the Government's Planning Practice Guidance issued on 6 March 2014. All are reasonable and necessary in the circumstances of this case, my reasons for imposing them being:
11. Condition 1 is the standard commencement condition imposed in accordance with section 91(1) (a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Condition 2 will ensure a satisfactory appearance to the completed development in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

¹ The National Planning Policy Framework.

² The London Borough of Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (December 2013).

12. Condition 3, which requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, provides certainty.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR