
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 6 October 2020

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2020

Appeal A Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3244774 8 Hamilton Road, Brentford TW8 0QE

- 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 Geoff Baxter against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00547/8/P6, dated 23 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a rear dormer roof extension, installation of 2no. rooflights and associated alterations.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3244775 8 Hamilton Road, Brentford TW8 0QE

- 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 Geoff Baxter against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00547/8/P5, dated 23 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey rear and rear infill extension and insertion of two roof windows to the first floor rear projection of the house.
-

Decisions

Appeal A - APP/F5540/D/20/3244774

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a rear dormer roof extension, installation of 2no. rooflights and associated alterations at 8 Hamilton Road, Brentford TW8 0QE, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00547/8/P6, dated 23 September 2019, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Appeal B - APP/F5540/D/20/3244775

2. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear and rear infill extension and insertion of two roof windows to the first floor rear projection of the house at 8 Hamilton Road, Brentford TW8 0QE, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00547/8/P5, dated 23 September 2019, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Procedural Matters

3. I have taken the description of development for Appeal A from the application form. While different to that given on the decision notice, no confirmation that any change was agreed has been provided.
4. I have taken the description of development for Appeal B from the appeal form and decision notice as it refers to the roof windows shown on the plans but not included on the application form description.

Main Issue

5. The main issue of the appeal is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the St Paul's Brentford Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

6. The appeal site is located within the CA. As such I have had regard to the duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing its character or appearance.
7. From my observations, and the St Pauls' Brentford Conservation Area Appraisal (the appraisal), the significance of the CA lies, in part, in the retention of its layout of tree lined streets with mainly Victorian properties and occasional landmark buildings. There is some variation to the appearance, scale and materials of the dwellings in the CA, individual streets and even within the same row of properties. Within Hamilton Road, while there is a general consistency in terms of bay window frontages, there is far less uniformity to the roofscape and rear elevations.

Appeal A

8. The SPD¹ states that as a rule, rear dormers should be less than half the width of the original roof, set 1m above the eaves and 1m down from the ridge. The appraisal highlights roof extensions as a pressure on the CA.
9. There are rear dormer windows present in the row of properties where the appeal site is located, including at the adjacent property. While of a different scale and design to the appeal proposal, they nonetheless demonstrate that the original roofscape of the row has already been disrupted.
10. Moreover, there is considerable variation in the roofscape along this side of Hamilton Road and the street behind which the appeal scheme would be viewed with. This includes rear dormer windows of differing sizes and designs, some of which are similar to the proposed scheme.
11. The proposed dormer would occupy a large proportion of the main rear roof. Nevertheless, it is positioned centrally, set down from the ridge, up from the eaves and in from the side roof boundaries to some degree and would utilise matching materials. Being located to the rear there would be limited views of the proposal from the surrounding streets. Where it would be seen, given the varied roofscape nearby the proposed dormer would not appear discordant.

¹ Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document A Guide for Householders

12. While the SPD says only 1 front rooflight would typically be acceptable, the Council do not raise concerns with the 2 rooflights proposed given the presence of these at properties in the immediate vicinity. As the proposed rooflights would be viewed with similar features at nearby dwellings I have reached the same finding.
13. Therefore, the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. It would accord with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan Volume One (LPV1). These, in part, require developments to respond to any local architectural vernacular and characteristics of the area and be subordinate to the existing building. Despite a breach of the SPD, on the individual circumstances of this case, the scheme would accord with its aim to protect the character and appearance of Conservation Areas.

Appeal B

14. The SPD states that a wrap around extension of an original rear projection within a conservation area will generally be refused to preserve the rhythm of a 2-storey outrigger. The appraisal identifies infills as a pressure on the CA and that properties in Hamilton Road are well detailed.
15. Nevertheless, while there are no wrap around extensions apparent in this individual row of properties, there is little consistency to the rear elevations of dwellings in the street and that backing on to the site. Moreover, numerous ground floor additions were apparent in the area. Two storey outriggers are a feature of properties in the area. However, their depth and form are not consistent, even within the row of properties where the appeal site is located.
16. Being a ground floor extension, the appeal scheme would retain the L shape outrigger feature at the more prominent first floor level. Being single storey, of a limited footprint and height, the extension would appear subservient to the dwelling.
17. The extension would be visible from nearby properties. Nonetheless, the fluctuating depths of the outriggers and presence of boundary treatments would aid in screening the extension. Furthermore, it would be viewed as part of the varied built form at the rear of properties nearby and the large areas of glazing would soften its appearance. As such, the extension would not challenge the prominence of the 2 storey outrigger.
18. Therefore, the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. It would accord with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the LPV1. These in part, require developments to respond to any local architectural vernacular and characteristics of the area and be subordinate to the existing building. Despite a breach of the SPD, on the individual circumstances of this case, the scheme would accord with its aim to ensure that in Conservation Areas new extensions do not dominate in terms of bulk, scale or design.

Conditions

19. For both appeals, in addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is to provide certainty. A further condition is imposed requiring the external materials of the scheme to match

those at the existing building to protect the character and appearance of the area. For the same reason a condition regarding the style of the front rooflights is imposed on Appeal A.

Conclusion

20. Consequently, for the reasons given above, and having taken into account all matters raised, I conclude that Appeal A and Appeal B should be allowed subject to the conditions in the attached schedules.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS Appeal A - Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3244774

- 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: Drawing No 2019-07-PAB-01; Drawing No 2019-07-PAB-02; Drawing No 2019-07-PAB-03; Drawing No 2019-07-PAB-04; Drawing No 2019-07-PAB-05; Drawing No 2019-07-PAB-06; Drawing No 2019-07-PAB-07; Drawing No 2019-07-PAB-08; and Drawing No 2019-07-PAB-09.
- 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.
- 4) The roof lights shall be 'conservation style', installed to be flush with the existing roof slope.

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS Appeal B - Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3244775

- 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: Drawing No 2019-08-PAA-01; Drawing No 2019-08-PAA-02; Drawing No 2019-08-PAA-03; Drawing No 2019-08-PAA-04; Drawing No 2019-08-PAA-05; Drawing No 2019-08-PAA-06; Drawing No 2019-08-PAA-07; Drawing No 2019-07-PAA-08; and Drawing No 2019-08-PAA-09.
- 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.