
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2020

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/20/3250245

First and Second Floor Flat, 79 Eastbury Grove, Chiswick, London W4 2JT

- 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 Philip Monk against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00383/79/P4, dated 20 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear dormer loft conversion over back addition including alterations to main loft. Two roof lights to front slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a rear dormer loft conversion over back addition including alterations to main loft; two roof lights to front slope at the first and second floor flat, 79 Eastbury Grove, Chiswick, London W4 2JT in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 00383/79/P4, dated 20 November 2019 subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision.

Procedural matter

2. An interested party states that the exact position and dimensions of the rear outrigger are not shown on the plan. My assessment of the proposal is based on all of the evidence before me and an inspection of the site and its surroundings. On that basis, I am satisfied that the details of the appeal scheme as shown on the drawings and detailed in the written evidence allow a reasonable assessment of the development sought.

Main issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area and on the living conditions of the occupiers of 77 and 81 Eastbury Grove with particular regard to light, outlook and sense of enclosure.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a mid-terrace building in use as flats within a mainly residential area that includes 2-storey terraces. At the rear of the terraces close to the appeal property, I saw many examples of buildings with significant built additions and alterations at high level, several of which were evident from the rear roof terrace of No 79. Whether or not some of these extensions were

built through the exercise of permitted development rights, their presence now forms an integral part of the area's character.

5. The proposed extension would add to the scale, mass and height of the existing 2-storey rear outrigger with the new flat roof visually accentuating its bulk. Nevertheless, the new addition would remain below the main ridge and set back some way from the main back wall and set in to one side from the flank wall below. As a result, the distinctive 'L' shape of the host building would remain with the new built form in place. The external materials would match those of the existing building and the new openings would be in keeping with the style of the host property. On that basis, the proposal would be a proportionate addition. It would be compatible with the intrinsic character and appearance of the appeal property.
6. Part of the proposed extension would be glimpsed at a tight angle from some distance along a short section of Ashbourne Grove. It would also be evident from the rears of the properties on either side of No 79 and some of those that address Devonshire Road, beyond the rear of the site. In these views, the proposal would either be seen in part or against the highly varied built form of the wider terrace to which No 79 belongs. Given that variety, no visual disharmony would result with the properties on either side of No 79 that have not been extended on top of their rear outrigger. I observed that several properties visible from the rear of No 79 include high-level rear extensions and some of these resemble the proposal in size, shape and position. In that context, the proposal would not be an uncharacteristic addition. It would not unduly dominate the rear façade nor be detrimental to the area's character.
7. No other significant alteration is proposed to the main roof aside from a larger window in the existing rear dormer and 2 new roof lights on the front roof slope. The Council appears to raise no objection to these elements of the appeal scheme, which I, too, find acceptable in design, size and in the relationship to the host building and the wider area.
8. On the first main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the local area. Accordingly, it does not conflict with Policies SC7, CC1 and CC2 of the Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (LP) or the Council's Supplementary Planning Document *Residential Extension Guidelines* (SPD). These policies and guidance seek to ensure that proposals conserve or enhance the area's character, complement the original building, harmonise with adjoining properties and carefully consider matters such as external appearance.

Living conditions

9. Of the properties in the vicinity of the site it is the occupiers of 77 and 81 Eastbury Grove, situated on either side of the site and closest to the proposal that are most likely to be affected. There are two dormer windows at second floor level in the rear elevation of No 81 from which part of the new extension would be evident. The nearest of these adjacent windows to the new extension appears to serve the landing to a staircase, which is a non-habitable room.
10. The other upper rear window of No 81 appears to serve a sitting area or lounge from which views of the proposed extension would be at an acute angle with the main source of natural lighting and outlook largely unaffected. While the proposal would be visible from the upper rear windows of No 81, its scale,

depth, height and position would not cause it to overly dominate outlook, unacceptably overshadow or unduly heighten a sense of enclosure for the occupiers of No 81 to the extent that planning permission should be refused.

11. The proposed extension would be modest in depth and set back from the shared boundary with No 77. This arrangement, coupled with the position of the new addition to the northwest of No 77 would limit the loss of natural light to the rear of this adjacent property. Views of the proposal from the second floor windows of No 77, which face slightly upward, and those from its first floor rear window would not be significantly affected. Consequently, the presence of the extension would not be so imposing as to increase a sense of enclosure for the occupiers of No 77.
12. On the second main issue, the proposed development would not materially harm the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos 77 or 81. As such, it does not conflict with LP Policies SC7 and CC2 or the SPD insofar as they aim to safeguard residential amenity.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings and to require that the development is carried out in accordance with them as this provides certainty. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, a condition is attached to require that the external materials match those of the existing building. To safeguard the living conditions of nearby occupiers, a condition is attached to limit the times in which construction works are carried out.
14. With one exception, these conditions follow those suggested by the Council save for minor amendments to more closely reflect national policy. A requirement that development begin before 14 November 2020, as suggested by the Council, has not been imposed. It would offer an unreasonably short time period from the grant of planning permission for construction to start.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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: Refs 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07 and the Location Plan, which shows the site edged red.
- 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) Demolition or construction works shall not take place outside 0800 hours to 1800 hours Mondays to Fridays and 0900 hours to 1300 hours on Saturdays nor at any time on Sundays or Bank and Public Holidays.