



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2025

by **R Cahalane BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3362352

43 and 44 Eastbourne Road, Brentford TW8 9PF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Talis Karklins against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/2594.
 - The development proposed is a joint application for No 43 and No 44 for a dormer loft conversion over the main existing roof with the raising of the ridge matching others in Grove Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have amended the address of the appeal site, as set out in the banner heading above. The site address in the planning application form is 43 Eastbourne Road, but its description of development makes it clear that the application is a joint application with No 44. The officer report also clearly assessed this as such. I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of Nos 43 and 44 Eastbourne Road, and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a pair of semi-detached two-storey properties (Nos 43 and 44) facing Eastbourne Road, with No 44 converted to two flats. These properties form a short row of period residential dwellings between the junctions of Windmill Road and Enfield Road. There are also nearby contemporary buildings, including the car dealership of No 1020 Great West Road on the opposite side of Eastbourne Road, along with some other various tall buildings in the wider vicinity.
5. Nos 43 and 44, and many nearby properties, have attractive period features including bay windows, yellow London stock brick detailing and traditional chimney forms, with some variation in ridge heights and other brick colours. Although Nos 43 and 44 do not contain sash windows like some other properties, they nonetheless contribute positively to an area of mixed built form as part of several generally well-preserved older residential properties.
6. The end-terraced No 1 Enfield Road is sited in close proximity at an angle towards Nos 43 and 44's rear gardens. The proposed dormer's side profile would therefore only be partially visible above this neighbour's lower shallow pitched roof form.

7. Along Grove Road, the proposed rear dormer would be more visible, as it runs parallel behind Eastbourne Road at relatively close proximity. Such views would only be partially restricted by trees along rear garden boundaries. The dormer would not be set back from the eaves, set down from the roof ridge, or meaningfully set in from either side boundary. Whilst the joint application approach seeks to maintain the symmetry of Nos 43 and 44 to provide a cohesive appearance, the rear dormer would nonetheless not be read as a subordinate or sympathetic addition to these properties.
8. Two Juliet style window openings are also proposed that would be significantly taller and wider than the first-floor rear windows below. This fenestration would further draw the eye to the bulky dormer roof addition which, in combination with its roof span and the proposed ridge height increase, would create a jarring top-heavy appearance that would unacceptably diverge from the forms and proportions of the nearest Eastbourne Road and Enfield Road terraces to each side.
9. The proposed rear dormer would therefore significantly harm the character of Nos 43 and 44 and their immediate setting when viewed from Grove Road. Utilisation of brick cheeks for the dormers and slate roof materials would not mitigate this adverse visual harm that I have identified.
10. The adjacent end-terraced No 45 Eastbourne Road has been recently extended, including a side hip-to-gable roof extension and a flat roof rear dormer roof extension, also visible from Grove Road. This rear dormer is however partially subsumed within the two-storey pitched roof outrigger. It is also significantly narrower than the appeal dormer, and is therefore a less prominent addition by comparison. Whilst the neighbouring two-storey rear outriggers are of greater depth than the proposed dormer, they are of traditional form that typify the era of these dwellings. These nearby built forms therefore do not justify allowing the appeal.
11. I accept that many of the nearby Grove Road terraced residences contain rear dormer additions, including ridge height increases and Juliet windows, as shown on one of the aerial images before me. These dormer additions are however mainly not visible from public street level, with only the side profile of No 11 visible next to a public house of broadly similar maximum roof height, when viewed in tandem.
12. Whilst I saw other rear dormer examples at street level, including along Avenue Road near its Enfield Road junction, this is beyond the immediate context of the appeal proposal. The full planning history of these examples is also not before me, and these additions may have benefitted from permitted development rights.
13. My attention has also been drawn to various other built form and roof extension examples along the abovementioned roads, and slightly further away on Whitstile Road, and further afield again south of the M4 flyover at Orchard Road and Hamilton Road, which are both in a Conservation Area. These all however have different built form compositions and contexts than the appeal site. These examples put before me therefore also do not justify allowing this appeal.
14. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed rear dormer would significantly harm the character and appearance of Nos 43 and 44, and the surrounding area. The dormer is thus contrary to Policies SC7, CC1 and CC2 of the Council's Local Plan 2015-2030 (LP) (adopted 2015). Collectively, these policies require, amongst other things, development proposals to be subordinate to the existing building and have regard to its quality, character and scale, respond to

local architectural vernacular that contributes to an area's character, and function well in their effect on surrounding areas.

15. I accept that the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (adopted 2017) forms guidance rather than absolute rules. Whilst some discretion can be applied to specific aspects of such guidance where justified, LP Policy SC7 also sets out that proposals should have regard to the further design guidance in Supplementary Planning Documents. The significant harm I have identified arising from the scale and design of the proposed dormer does not justify its departure from the SPD guidance, principally the recommended set down or set in distances from the eaves, ridge and side boundaries.
16. The proposed ridge height increase would be of similar height to No 45 and whilst it would be higher than No 1 Enfield Road, it would be of broadly similar height to the longer ridges of Nos 3 and 5 further along that terrace. The proposal also includes six rooflights on the front elevation roof plane, three within each property. There are several examples of properties containing more than one front rooflight in the immediate vicinity, including the adjacent No 45. The proposed ridge height increase and rooflights would therefore not in themselves harm the character and appearance of Nos 43 and 44 and the surrounding area.

Planning Balance

17. I have found that the proposed rear dormer would significantly harm the character and appearance of Nos 43 and 44, and the surrounding area, contrary to Policies SC7, CC1 and CC2 of the LP. This proposal is thus contrary to the development plan as a whole.
18. The proposal would address the practical needs of some existing occupants that are of exceptionally tall height. It seeks to follow the principles of adapting spaces to accommodate physical characteristics and the diverse needs of residents throughout their lives, as set out in the London Plan and Building Regulations Approved Document M. The scheme would also provide additional accommodation in an escalating climate of housing shortage in London, which has led to a rise in the "boomerang children" phenomenon.
19. It has not however been adequately demonstrated that the current proposal is the least harmful way to meet the needs of the appellant's family. I therefore cannot afford sufficient weight in favour of the benefits of the proposal to outweigh the long-term adverse visual impact that would arise after its construction.
20. The material considerations before me therefore do not carry sufficient weight to indicate that a decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

R Cahalane

INSPECTOR