
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2020

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3253956

34 Clitherow Road, Brentford TW8 9JS

- 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 Aida Dugandzic against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00285/34/P3, dated 30 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear roof extension to existing outrigger incorporating obscurely glazed side window and one side roof light.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a rear roof extension to existing outrigger incorporating obscurely glazed side window and one side roof light at 34 Clitherow Road, Brentford TW8 9JS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00285/34/P3, dated 30 March 2020, 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: Location Plan; A1; A2; B1 and B2.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. At the time of the site visit, an extension in the form of a dormer within the rear roofslope was being erected under the permitted development rights available for an end of terrace dwelling house. The proposed development includes the erection of a further dormer which would be located within the roofslope of the 2-storey outrigger. This would connect to the rear dormer to create an 'L' shaped roof extension.
4. In addition to the dormer being erected, the appeal property has already been altered and is located within a primarily residential area comprising short

terraces of dwellings and semi-detached dwellings. A number of the dwellings have been altered, including through the erection of large rear roof additions. The appellant has identified at 8 Clitherow Road an extension of a similar design to the proposed development which was granted planning permission in 2013 (Ref 00285/8/P1). This scheme was only partially visible during the site visit and, as such, it has only been given limited weight in the determination of this appeal which has been assessed on its own circumstances.

5. The proposed development would be modest in scale and would, on its own, not visually dominate the outrigger's roofslope. The proposed dormer would not exceed the roof's ridge height and would be sited above the eaves. There would be a significant expanse of roof between the proposed dormer and rear elevation of the outrigger.
6. The appeal scheme would link with the rear dormer currently being erected. However, although there would be a cumulative increase in the size of the roof alterations, the combined dormers would not result in a scale or form of development that would visually dominate the appearance of the roof to a materially greater extent than the rear dormer. The combined dormer would not be so disproportionate in scale to this already altered property or its roof so as to cause unacceptable harm to its character and appearance.
7. With the exception of some rear gardens, because of its siting and the screening afforded by the outrigger, the proposed dormer would not be a visually prominent addition to the property's roof. The proposed development would not be seen from the road and only a small part of the dormer's cheek would be visible from the footpath between Boston Manor Road and Clitherow Road. The scale, siting and appearance of the appeal scheme, including in combination with the rear dormer, would not cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding primarily residential area where large roof additions are a common feature. However, it is appropriate that the proposed development utilises external material which match the those of the existing roof and this can be secured by a condition.
8. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would not conflict with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030: Volume 1. Amongst other matters, these policies require development to respond to an area's character sensitively and creatively and for residential extensions to complement the original building and harmonise with adjoining properties.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested several conditions in the event this appeal succeeds which have been assessed against the tests in the Planning Practice Guidance. For reason of clarity a condition is necessary for the appeal scheme to be erected in accordance with the approved drawings and, for the reasons already given to be erected in external materials matching those of the host property. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be allowed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR