



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2021

**by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 12 February 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/20/3260674**

**33 Staveley Road, Chiswick, London W4 3HU**

- 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 Hannah Winter against the decision of Council of London Borough of Hounslow.
  - The application Ref 01069/33/P6 dated 13 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2020.
  - The development proposed is form an infill corner roof extension to connect the two existing rear and side dormers, flatten the pitched roofs of existing dormers and alteration to windows by insertion of French double doors and slot window to rear dormer, three new side windows to replace existing window and new roof light.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for an infill corner roof extension to connect the two existing rear and side dormers, flatten the pitched roofs of existing dormers and alteration to windows by insertion of French double doors and slot window to rear dormer, three new side windows to replace existing window and new roof light at 33 Staveley Road, Chiswick, London W4 3HU in accordance with the terms of the application ref: 01069/33/P6, dated 13 May 2020, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development to which this permission relates shall be begun within a period of three years commencing on the date of this decision;
  - 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2001 EX00, 2001 PA07, 2001 PA08, 2001 PA09 and 2001 PA10.
  - 3) The windows formed in the side elevation shall be obscure glazed, hinged to open inwards and shall not be repaired or replaced otherwise than with obscured glazing. Any changes must be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority prior to installation on site;
  - 4) Prior to commencement of the development a schedule and samples of all external materials to be used shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details;
  - 5) No demolition or construction work shall take place on the site except between the hours of 08:00 to 16:00 on Mondays to Friday and 09:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays and none shall take place on Sundays and Public Holidays without the prior agreement of the Local Planning Authority.

## **Procedural Matters**

2. Appeal APP/F5540/D/20/3260673 was determined at the same time following the same site visit, however, they are classed as two standalone (not linked) cases. I note that it is contended by the appellant that the proposals should be considered together, however, they were originally submitted as separate applications. The proposals are considered on their own merits and the appeal decisions are separate.
3. The appellant was given seven days to respond with any comments or objections to the application of a pre-commencement condition relating to external materials. No response was received so the condition has been applied for the reasons outlined later in this decision letter.
4. Whilst the appellant's submissions seem to suggest and/or cover an argument relating to issue with potential impact on neighbouring properties amenity, I have no evidence before me to suggest that this is an issue (subject to conditions) nor does it form part of the Council's reasons for refusal. The main issue, to be considered, is that as outlined below.

## **Main Issues**

5. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character of the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the Chiswick House Conservation Area.

## **Reasons**

6. The appeal site is a 1920s semi-detached residential dwelling which is located in a residential area. The site stands within the Chiswick House Conservation Area (CA). As per the development description the property benefits from two existing, side and rear, dormers.
7. I noted from my site visit that neighbouring properties do have relatively substantial roof extensions (including no. 31 Staveley Road immediately adjacent which has a virtually full width dormer). The Council have not provided a statement within this appeal and I have nothing before me to suggest the neighbouring dormers are not legal (whether directly through a consent granted or through passage of time). I find that they are, therefore, part of the character of the area and the proposal is consistent with these which would mean it would harmonise with the adjoining properties and not harm the existing character of the private realm.
8. It is evident, from my walk down Staveley Road, that a number of properties have been altered and extended which I find means there is not a strong uniform character between the dwellings within the CA. In addition there are notable number of properties along Staveley Road which have roof extensions similar to the appeal site as it currently stands. The proposal would maintain the varied character of the area. The Council have not provided robust evidence of any assessment of actual impact of the proposed development on the significance of the designated heritage asset as required within the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.
9. Given the bulk of the existing dormers on the host dwelling I do not find the design of the corner extension to harm the character of the property. There would be a loss of some original roof pitch to the rear elevation, however, this

- is already viewed against the existing side dormer which is already a dominant feature when viewed from the rear elevation. The host dwelling would not look any different from the front elevation. The proposal would, overall, not be prominent within the street scene and the overall increase in volume, compared to the existing dormers, is limited. The existing dormers are already dominant. I do not find that the infill position, limited increase in size, design or appearance would result in an intrusive alteration which is out of scale and character with the host property (or the CA as discussed further below).
10. The side dormer is the element which would be visible in views along Staveley Road when outside the property. This is an existing element and such views would be limited. Furthermore, there is a tree to the front of the property which shields the front elevation within the streetscene. The alterations to the pitched roof, and windows, would not particularly alter views of this element. I do not find that the corner roof extension, to connect the existing rear and side dormer, would impact on the character of the CA, given the neighbouring dormer development both immediately adjacent to and in the immediate area of the appeal site.
  11. The proposal would be limited in views from the public realm and wider views in the CA given the site context including the established vegetation and trees to the rear of the appeal site. In addition to this the orientation of the properties along Sutton Court Road means that even private views of the appeal site, within the CA, would be limited. I find that there would be no real impact upon the appearance of the CA and there would be no impact upon Chiswick House and its surrounding grounds. The character and appearance of the CA would be preserved.
  12. The proposal would be consistent with London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015 (LP) Policy CC1 which requires development to respond to the wider context and history of the area and LP Policy CC2 which requires proposals to respond meaningfully to the site and its characteristics. The proposal would also be consistent with LP Policy CC4 which requires any development within a CA to conserve and take opportunities to enhance the character of the area and LP Policy SC7 which requires that alterations and additions do not harm the existing character of the building and its context and expects development to harmonise with adjoining properties and maintain the character of the general street scene.
  13. I acknowledge that the Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document 2017 ultimately seeks to avoid dominant roof extensions. Despite this I do not find the limited conflict with this guidance to be sufficient to warrant refusal given my findings that the infill/alterations is/are modest compared to the bulk of the existing dormers compared to the host property.

### **Conditions**

14. The Council has suggested two conditions within this appeal but I find it appropriate, for the reasons outlined, to add further conditions on the consent granted. A condition requiring the development to be in accordance with the approved plans is required in order to control and define the development which is granted consent. A time condition is attached to comply with section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. In order to ensure appropriate privacy for the neighbouring property I have attached a condition as to window specification for the side elevation.

15. In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance, I have attached a condition requiring approval of the materials for the external elevations. Unlike with construction work at ground level, it is not possible to condition timings to those such as “no development above slab level” and there are no foundation works etc. The nature of the proposal is that works would be relatively quick so to ensure appropriate details are secured, I have applied the condition as a pre-commencement condition. To protect neighbouring residential amenity during construction a condition limiting timings of constructions works is required.

**Conclusion**

16. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

*Eleni Randle*

INSPECTOR