

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 May 2017

by David Spencer BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/17/3170707

102 Barrowgate Road, Chiswick, London W4 4QP

- 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 Ms Fiona Evans against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00079/102/P3, dated 30 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey extension to an existing outbuilding at the rear garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey extension to an existing outbuilding at the rear garden at No.102 Barrowgate Road, Chiswick, London W4 4QP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00079/102/P3, 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: Site Location Plan at 1:1250 scale reference #00160834-ECF-107; Block Plan at 1:500 scale reference #00160836-4C6C7D; Drawing 521.03; Drawing 521.04; and Flood Risk Assessment.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The outbuilding hereby permitted shall not be used as a bedroom, kitchen or living room and shall not be occupied as separate or ancillary residential accommodation or for business use.
 - 5) No additional windows or other glazed openings shall be formed in the walls or roof of the development hereby permitted and no additional doors inserted in the building without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposed development is taken from the decision notice and appeal form which I consider provides a more accurate description of what is proposed.
-

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. No.102 Barrowgate Road like other dwellings in this part of Chiswick has a reasonably sized rear garden ending with a single storey outbuilding separating the garden from a rear access road area beyond. This access road area also serves corresponding single storey outbuildings similarly arranged to serve development along Ellesmere Road further to the south. Whilst the established outbuildings are single storey in scale, there is considerable variety to their appearance and quality.
5. I noted the variety of positions of the outbuildings within their respective plots, a number of which are situated close to the boundary. The appeal proposal would modestly enlarge the footprint of the existing building extending to the boundary with No.104 Barrowgate Road and to a very modest degree into the rear garden. I do not consider this enlarged footprint would be harmfully at odds with the assorted appearance and pattern of other outbuildings in the locality. Given the position of the two directly adjoining outbuildings it would remain to be seen as part of an established group of ancillary structures.
6. The proposed eaves height would remain comparable with the height of the existing flat roof of the outbuilding. Given the width of the building the degree of pitch to the higher ridge line would, nonetheless, remain relatively limited given the ridge would be below 4 metres in height. Accordingly, whilst the altered roof would be more pronounced compared to other outbuildings, the shallow pitch to the apex would retain a sense of spaciousness and would not be overbearing. The proposed scale and roof design of the extended outbuilding would remain to be clearly perceived as a subservient single storey structure when viewed from within rear gardens or the rear access road area.
7. I therefore conclude that the development would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore accord with the design objectives of Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 which seek, amongst other things, to enhance environmental quality and townscape and secure high quality design. The proposal would also be consistent with the objective of the National Planning Policy Framework to secure high quality design.
8. I note that the appeal proposal would contravene technical specifications in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Residential Extension Guidelines (2003) in Section 7 on detached outbuildings. However, I have found that the particular circumstances at the appeal location means that, notwithstanding a marginally larger building than the SPG advises, there would be no significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

9. Concern has been raised that the outbuilding could be occupied as residential accommodation. I am satisfied that this can be satisfactorily controlled through the use of a restrictive condition. I note the extended outbuilding would be close to adjoining boundaries however private matters relating to future maintenance would be adequately covered by separate legislation.

Conclusion and Conditions

10. For the reasons set out above, and having considered all other matters before me, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
11. Other than the standard time limit condition, I consider a condition controlling the external materials and finishes to the extension necessary in the interests of local character and appearance. I am also imposing a condition that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, which is considered necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
12. The Local Planning Authority (LPA) has also suggested a condition restricting the use of the outbuilding as separate or ancillary accommodation or business use. I consider such a condition is necessary in order to maintain the character of the area and to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties. The LPA has also suggested an additional condition restricting further windows and openings being installed other than those on the approved plans. Again, I consider such a condition is necessary in the interests of protecting the amenities of neighbouring properties.

David Spencer

Inspector.