

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2016

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 29 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/16/3156612
23 Winscombe Crescent, Ealing, W5 1AZ

- 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 Matt Barr against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 162211, dated 13 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is the addition of a conservation type roof light on the side elevation to finish flush with the tiles.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

3. 23 Winscombe Crescent is a two storey semi-detached house located in the Brentham Garden Estate conservation area. The Estate was established as part of the Garden City movement in the early 20th century. This part of the conservation area is characterised by substantial semi-detached and terraced houses constructed in a distinctive style of brick and painted roughcast render with a variety of striking architectural features. The tiled roofs are high and steeply sloping, and generally hipped with large chimneys. Nos. 23 and 21 are one of two pairs of semis in the street with catslide dormers to the front and roofs that sweep down to an eaves height between the ground and first floors to form asymmetrical gables.
4. Policies relevant in this appeal include 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the Consolidated London Plan 2015, 1.1 and 1.2 of the Ealing Development Strategy Development Plan Document 2012 (the DSDPD) and 7.4, 7B and 7C of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document 2013 (the DMDPD). Among other things, these require new development to be of a high quality of design and architecture appropriate to its context, to complement the

detailing of buildings in the area and to retain and enhance characteristic features and detailing in conservation areas.

5. The proposal is for a modest sized conservation style roof light on the side roof slope facing north. There is already one such roof light in this roof slope located slightly more than halfway towards the rear which was permitted as part of a loft conversion. That scheme originally included the roof light the subject of this appeal but this was removed because it was considered that it would add clutter to the roofscape and so be harmful to the conservation area.
6. The permitted roof light is largely screened from views from street level by a large chimney. However, the proposal would be clearly visible forward of the chimney because of the wide gap between No. 23 and the neighbouring property to the north. It is clear that tight control has been exercised over detailed alterations to properties such as roof lights in the conservation area and, in my opinion, this is important in order to maintain its special character and architectural integrity.
7. I sympathise with the appellant's wish to improve the family accommodation. However, I consider that the proposed roof light, in conjunction with the existing one, would result in an unacceptable additional break in the otherwise clean sweep of the roof and add clutter. I saw during my visit that there are very few roof lights visible from the street in the surrounding area and, in my view, this helps to maintain an important and distinctive characteristic of the conservation area, namely its roof forms.
8. While it is an established planning principle that each case is determined on its merits, allowing this appeal would make it difficult for the Council to resist similar proposals. If this were to happen I consider that the resultant cumulative effect would harm the special character of the conservation area.
9. I conclude that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the existing house itself and of this part of the conservation area, contrary to policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan, 1.1 and 1.2 of the DSDPD and 7.4, 7B and 7C of the DMDPD.
10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR