
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 August 2020

by R Sabu BA(Hons) MA BArch PgDip ARB RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3245845

71 Cranbrook Road, Chiswick, London W4 2LJ

- 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 Mrs Ekaterina Harwood against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00312/71/P1, dated 19 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of rear outrigger roof extension with Juliette balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of rear outrigger roof extension with Juliette balcony at 71 Cranbrook Road, Chiswick, London W4 2LJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00312/71/P1, dated 19 November 2019, 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: 1403 1250, 1403 405 PR.
 - 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.

Procedural Matters

2. While I note the appellants names in the application form, since one name is stated in the appeal form, the appeal proceeds under that name only.
3. Construction at the property was underway at the time of my site visit. There were a number of alterations to the property that are not indicated on the drawings before me. I have therefore assessed the appeal based on the drawings before me rather than the built development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. Cranbrook Road is a residential street primarily characterised by two storey dwellings with similar forms and features that give the area an attractive character and appearance. The host property is sited in a prominent position on the corner of the road and has an uncommon design with the main entrance at the side of the building and two storey bay windows on the adjacent elevation around the corner. As such, while its traditional style and materials are in keeping with the other properties on the street, it has a unique character and given its corner position and two elevations fronting the street, it has a larger appearance than the other dwellings.
6. The proposed erection of the rear outrigger roof extension would be in addition to a rear dormer extension that was granted a Certificate of Lawfulness¹. Since construction was underway at the time of my site visit, it is likely that that extension will be completed regardless of the outcome of this appeal. Therefore, the proposed development would be likely to be viewed against that dormer extension and I have assessed the appeal accordingly.
7. The pitched roof of the existing rear outrigger would be altered to a flat roof. From the evidence before me and my observations during the site visit, a number of rear outriggers in the vicinity of the site have been altered in a similar fashion such that they form part of the character and appearance of the area. While the proposed rear outrigger roof extension would be highly visible from the street whereas neighbouring rear extensions are less visible, it would be viewed alongside the approved rear dormer extension and against the host property which has a unique form compared with other properties. Moreover, the roof of the proposed outrigger roof extension would be set down from the dormer extension roof and would be set back from the eaves of the main building such that the proposal would not appear dominant against the host building.
8. In addition, the proposed materials and form of the proposal would be in harmony with the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. Therefore, although the form of the outrigger would be altered, and the overall building would appear larger than existing, given the unique form of the host building and the prevalence of other outrigger extensions in the area, the proposed scheme would not appear dominant or incongruent against the neighbouring buildings or wider surroundings.
9. While I note the Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document A Guide for Householders Adopted 20th December 2017 (SPD), given my findings above, the proposal would not conflict with the aims of this document.
10. Consequently, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Therefore, it would not conflict with Policies CC1 and CC2 of the Local Plan 2015 – 2030 Volume 1 (LP) which, among other things, requires developments to respond to the wider context and history of the area and relates to urban design and architecture. It would also not conflict with LP Policy SC7 which among other things seek developments that complement the original building, harmonise with adjoining

¹ Council ref: 00312/71/LAW1

properties and maintain the general character of the street scene. It would also not conflict with the aims of the SPD.

Other Matters

11. I note the evidence regarding the personal circumstances of the appellants. However, I have assessed the appeal based on its planning merits and this has not altered my overall decision.
12. I acknowledge the scheme at No. 130A Cranbrook Road. However, that property appears to be in the middle of a terrace and is therefore not directly comparable with this appeal which has been determined on its own merits.

Conditions

13. While the Council has not suggested any conditions, a standard commencement condition and a condition specifying plans is necessary in the interests of certainty. Since the rear dormer extension, which was granted a Certificate of Lawfulness, was under construction at the time of my site visit, I have specified the plan showing the proposal in the context of that scheme. In addition, a condition requiring materials to match the existing is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

RSabu

INSPECTOR