



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 March 2023

by Kim Langford Tejrar LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/23/3316434
23 Clitherow Road, Brentford TW8 9JT

- 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 Ms Bridget Rattigan against the decision of London Borough of Hounslow Council.
 - The application Ref 00285/23/P5, dated 09 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 04 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is 'Erection of a second floor extension to the house's two storey outrigger attached to the existing rear roof dormer extension'.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The description of development was changed following submission of the application. I have utilised the amended description, which better describes the development proposed.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the '*Erection of a second floor extension to the house's two storey outrigger attached to the existing rear roof dormer extension*' at 23 Clitherow Road, Brentford TW8 9JT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 00285/23/P5, dated 09 September 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - a) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - b) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Existing floor plans No-01 dated 09/11/2022, Existing/ proposed elevations No-02 dated 09/11/2022, Existing / proposed elevations No-03 dated 09/11/2022, Proposed ground floor plan No-04 dated 09/11/2022, Proposed first floor plan No-05 dated 09/11/2022, Proposed second floor plan No-06 dated 09/11/2022, Existing and proposed roof plans No-09 dated 15/11/2002, Proposed block plan No-07 dated 07/11/2022, and Site location plan.
 - c) Notwithstanding condition (b) above, the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in materials which match the external surfaces of the existing building.
 - d) 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

windows/dormer windows or other openings other than those expressly authorised by this permission shall be constructed on the development hereby permitted.

Main Issue

3. The main issue for the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the development on the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached two-storey (with a second-storey roof extension) end of terrace house, situated within a primarily residential area comprising of modest short terraces and semi-detached houses. The appeal site has a large, deep rear two storey outrigger and an existing dormer roof extension at second storey level which benefits from a Certificate of Lawful Existing Development (CLED).
5. The appeal scheme proposes to extend the existing roof extension beyond the plane of the original rear elevation onto the roof of the outrigger. The proposed extension would be modest in depth, width and height; its height not rising above the existing pitch of the outrigger. There would be a cumulative increase in the mass of the roof, however, the scale and form of the development would not dominate the already sizeable dwelling, and it would not create an imbalanced or contrived appearance given the depth and height of the existing extensions at first and ground floor levels.
6. As such, the scheme would not dominate the outrigger or the overall extended dwelling, due to its relative scale and siting.
7. The appeal site is not located within a Conservation Area and thus it is the character of the public domain which is material. Given the tight grain and closely aligned pattern of development within Clitherow Road, it would be unlikely that the extended roof would be visible within the street scene or wider public domain. In any case, it is possible to glimpse similar rear roof extensions along Clitherow Road and surrounding roads, so a visible rear roof extension would integrate within this context and would not appear incongruous.
8. The Appellant has referred to several examples of roof extensions in the vicinity, including at numbers 8, 13, 16, 34 and 37. The roof extension at 34 Clitherow Road was similar to that proposed by this scheme and was allowed on appeal (PINs Ref. APP/F5540/D/20/3253956). I have had regard to these examples for the purpose of consistency in decision making, however, the examples were either entirely unviewable from the site or were only slightly visible, as such, I have considered the appeal scheme on its own context and merits. In any case, these examples demonstrate that such development is not particularly prominent in the private domain.
9. For these reasons, the appeal scheme complies with policies SC7, CC1 and CC2 of the Hounslow Local Plan Volume One, adopted 2015, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework and relevant guidance. These policies seek, amongst other things, high quality design which complements original buildings and responds to the local architectural vernacular and the area's character.

Conditions

10. The Council has requested a total of four conditions. It has requested conditions requiring that the development is commenced within three years, is constructed in accordance with the approved plans and in materials which match the existing building. It has also requested a condition to prevent additional windows, doors or other glazed openings, in order to protect the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring property. I consider these conditions to be reasonable and justified in accordance with the legal and policy tests for conditions; to ensure that the development takes place in accordance with the proposed plans, in a timely manner, in a way that integrates it with the existing building and character of the area, and which protects the living conditions of neighbours.
11. At the time of my visit, I noted that a much larger outrigger was under construction. Neither main party has made any representations in respect of this development, and I am unaware as to its planning status. In the interests of clarity, and to ensure the correct scale of development takes place in accordance with the approved plans rather than proportionate to an outrigger of much greater scale, I have also referred to the 'existing plans' in the relevant condition.

Conclusion

12. For these reasons, the appeal scheme accords with the relevant policies of the development plan and no material considerations indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is accordingly allowed.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR