



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 18 October 2021

by Mark Ollerenshaw BSc (Hons) MTPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/21/3269736

Flat First Floor, 9 Alkerden Road, Chiswick, London W4 2HP

- 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 Zak Guest against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 00030/9(FF)/P1, dated 9 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'to extend into the loft space in order to form a rear dormer and outrigger'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to extend into the loft space in order to form a rear dormer and outrigger at Flat First Floor, 9 Alkerden Road, Chiswick, London W4 2HP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00030/9(FF)/P1, dated 9 October 2020, subject to the following 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: Location Plan, 1479 201 and 1479 202.
 - 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) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional windows, doors or other glazed openings other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be formed in the side or rear elevations of the development hereby approved.

Preliminary Matters

2. The planning application was submitted with Ms Zak Guest as the applicant, however this is a typographical error and it is clear that the applicant was Mr Zak Guest. The appeal form indicated Ms Sabina Dziurman as the appellant. It was subsequently confirmed that Mr Zak Guest had instructed Ms Sabina Dziurman to conduct the appeal on his behalf. However, as the appeal can only proceed in the name of the original applicant and cannot be transferred to another person, the citation in the header above reflects this.

3. On 20 July 2021, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework was published. However, it does not materially alter the national policy approach in respect of the issues raised in this appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a first floor flat situated in a row of terraced properties on the north side of Alkerden Road in a predominantly residential area. The surrounding area comprises mainly two storey terraced properties, though many also have accommodation within their roofspace. Whilst the front elevations of the terraced properties have a very uniform character, the rear elevations are of more diverse appearance due to the variety of extensions and alterations that have taken place. A common feature of properties in the area are two storey rear outriggers such as that located to the rear of the appeal property.
6. The Council's Residential Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2017 states that any roof extension can have a big impact on the appearance of a house and the surrounding area and therefore it is important to make the size of the extension secondary to the size of the roof face within which it would be set.
7. The proposed dormer to the main roof would be as wide as the existing building and, though it would not exceed the ridge height of the property, it would nevertheless be a substantial addition to the rear roof slope. Positioned at a lower level than the dormer, the proposed roof extension would extend part way over the rear outrigger and would be set in from the side of the roof, such that the pitched roof of the outrigger would remain partially visible.
8. There are numerous examples of other large rear dormers and roof extensions on Alkerden Road and within the surrounding area generally, including to the neighbouring property to the east, 11 Alkerden Road and to a property to the rear of the appeal site on Swanscombe Road. Whilst many of the dormers in the area may have been constructed under permitted development rights, they do nevertheless form part of the character and appearance of the area.
9. Viewed from the rear garden of the appeal property and from the rear of neighbouring properties, the proposals would be visible at high level, and would be similar in scale and design to the dormers and roof extensions to neighbouring properties. Due to the discreet position of the dormers at the rear of the property, the proposals would not be prominent or discordant in the street scene. The rear of the terrace is visible from Swanscombe Road to the east. However, from this location a number of large rear dormers are visible and the proposed development would be largely concealed behind the existing dormer and outrigger at 11 Alkerden Road.
10. The proposals would not strictly accord with the guidance in the SPD relating to dormers and roof extensions. However, taking into account the existing dormer extensions and roof extensions in the surrounding area, the proposals would not appear out of place. Moreover, the proposals would be clad in roof tiles which would ensure that they assimilate with the host property.

11. Lack of conformity with the provisions of SPDs is not the same as conflict with policies of a development plan. Indeed, the SPD in this case is presented as guidance. With this in mind, and for the above reasons, the appeal scheme would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. As such, it would comply with Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is of high quality design which complements the original building and the character of the area.

Conditions

12. I have had regard to the Council's suggested conditions. I have modified the wording of some of these conditions without altering their fundamental aims. The standard time limit condition and a condition specifying the relevant plans are necessary as these provide certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, it is necessary to include a condition that the external materials of the extensions match the existing building. The Council have suggested a condition requiring no additional windows, doors or other glazed openings to be formed in the dormer and roof extension. Such a condition is reasonable in order to protect the privacy of neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, and subject to the conditions specified, the appeal should be allowed.

Mark Ollerenshaw

INSPECTOR