



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 May 2024

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/24/3337517
12 Montgomery Road, Chiswick, W4 5LZ

- 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 Chee Ho Wan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
- The application Ref 234038HH, dated 5 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 23 November 2023.
- The proposed development is dormer roof extension to the main roof incorporating two rooflights to front roof slope; roof extension to rear outrigger roof slope.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for dormer roof extension to the main roof incorporating two rooflights to front roof slope; roof extension to rear outrigger roof slope at 12 Montgomery Road, Chiswick W4 5LZ in accordance with the terms of application ref: 234038HH, dated 5 October 2023, and 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: ST_AUG 23_12 MON_LP (location plan and block plan), ST_AUG 23_12 MON_001 Rev A (existing plans, sections and elevations), ST_AUG 23_12 MON_002 Rev A (proposed plans, sections and elevations) and ST_AUG 23_12 MON_003 Rev A (sight line).
 - 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. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a terraced two storey dwelling, one of a group of four similar properties. They are finished in brick elevations, some of which are painted, with a pleasant front façade incorporating decorative parapet roof with flat roof behind. To the rear is a traditional two storey 'outrigger' extension with pitched roof. The four dwellings of which the appeal site is a part are noticeable as a distinctive group within the street scene of Montgomery Road which is predominantly characterised by dwellings with pitched roofs.

4. The proposed roof extension would introduce a pitched roof form behind and set back from the front parapet with flat roofed dormer extensions to the rear roofslopes. The rear additions would not be visible in the street scene of Montgomery Road, but the front addition would be likely to be visible as well as the 'extended' chimney, the original stack being increased in height in a matching design.
5. The proposal would introduce a 'new' roof element in the context of the group of four terraced dwellings of which the appeal site is an integral part. However, due to its set back position and sloping roof design, the distinctive parapet edge would not be affected and would remain as the dominant feature seen within the street scene.
6. In terms of the wider street scene, given the proposed position and design of the roof addition, it would not be unduly prominent with only its upper part likely to be noticeable. Furthermore, it would only likely be seen from the opposite side of the road and mainly in approaches from the east where the upper front part of the appeal site dwelling is visible above the roof of the adjacent dwelling to the north-east. Whilst the overall height of the sloping roof would be higher than that of the existing chimney, it would not be significantly higher such as to unduly detract from the street scene. Furthermore, what would be visible of the proposed pitched roof would be seen within the context of the existing adjoining pitched roofs, albeit higher, with the chimney maintaining a complementary traditional feature.
7. Overall, I find that there would not be an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the group of dwellings of which the appeal site forms a part nor on the wider street scene. The proposal would accord with Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management DPD (2013) which seek to ensure that new development complements building patterns, scale and detailing, and achieves a high standard of amenity for users through coherent development and positive visual impact. It would also comply with policies D3 and D4 of The London Plan (2021) which seek to ensure a design led approach that responds to site context and capacity for growth and achieves high quality design. The proposal would also satisfy the aims and objectives of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 4, Residential Extensions, which provides guidance that seeks to ensure that roof extensions respect the design of the original dwelling and use matching materials.
8. The proposal would also accord with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to achieve good design and development that is sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

Conclusions

9. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

P B Jarvis

INSPECTOR