
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2016

by G J Fort BA PGDip LLM MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 08 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/16/3164460

2 Berrymead Gardens, Acton, Ealing W3 8AA

- 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 Expo Decor Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 164398FUL, dated 19 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a roof extension at 2 Berrymead Gardens, Acton, Ealing W3 8AA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 164398FUL, dated 19 September 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Block & Location Plans 251_2BG_X000; Second Floor Plan PROPOSED 251_2BG_D101; Third Floor Plan PROPOSED 251_2BG_D102; Section A-A PROPOSED 251_2BG_D103; Side Elevation PROPOSED 251_2BG_D104; Front Elevation & Rear Elevation PROPOSED 251_2BG_D105.
 - 3) The materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby approved shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. At the site visit, my attention was drawn to a planning consent of 3 February 2017 (the extant permission) concerning the appeal building, which includes proposals for roof alteration¹. I sought and received comments from the parties on the bearing of this matter on the current appeal, and as a consequence, I am satisfied that no prejudice would occur as a result of my consideration of the extant permission as part of my assessment of the appeal.

¹ Council ref: 166367FUL

Main Issues

3. I consider the main issues in this appeal to be the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of its host building and surroundings.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a substantial brick-faced gable-ended building of three storeys addressing Berrymead Gardens, a street with a gentle curve and gradual slope up towards its junction with High Street, to which the appeal property is adjacent. To one side, a wide gap separates the appeal property from the rear of the large corner building that fronts onto High Street; to the other it is attached to one of the two-storey terraced houses, which front both sides of Berrymead Gardens and follow its gradual curve down the slope. The appeal building is something of a one-off in the streetscene, of considerably different scale and detailing to the terraces along Berrymead Gardens; and not as prominent or as architecturally detailed as the corner buildings that address High Street. Although a prominent porch has been added at the front, the appeal building has a double-fronted façade of a symmetrical character featuring a pair of two-storey bay windows.
5. The proposed development would comprise a mansard roof extension with two dormer windows to the front and three smaller dormers to the rear. The scale of the flank wall and party wall upstand would be increased to provide side elevations for the roof.
6. I saw that the appeal building's position towards the top of the slope of Berrymead Gardens, its scale and separation from the nearest High Street property render its gable elevation a prominent feature in the streetscene. The appeal building's party wall upstand is visible in some views from the opposite direction. However, the character of the appeal building is considerably different to that of its immediate neighbours and the prevailing pattern of Berrymead Gardens. The proposed development would increase the appeal property's scale, but not to an extent that would render the building an overly dominant feature in the streetscene, particularly as the increased scale would not challenge the dominance of the more architecturally detailed corner building fronting High Street.
7. Moreover, I saw mansard roofs across Berrymead Gardens from, and inter-visible with, the appeal building and thus the proposed development would not read as an incongruous or alien element in this respect. As a result the proposed development would not look out of kilter with the wider streetscene and accordingly, I find that it would cause no material harm to the character or appearance of its surroundings.
8. Whilst the proposed development would increase the scale of the roof, this would not be to an extent that would overwhelm, or appear out of proportion with, the considerable three-storey scale of the appeal building's gable and principal elevations. As a consequence, the proposed roof would not read as an overly dominant feature of the appeal building. Moreover, the proposed dormers would be proportional to, and in overall alignment with, the fenestration pattern of the elevations beneath and as a result would not disrupt their architectural balance. Consequently, I consider that the proposed

development would not impart an overdeveloped appearance to the host building, or cause any material harm to its character and appearance.

9. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, I find that the proposed development would cause no material harm to the character and appearance of its host building or those of its surroundings. Consequently, I consider that the proposed development would not conflict with Policy 1.1 of Ealing's Development Strategy (adopted April 2012) (the Development Strategy); or Policies 7.4 and 7B of Ealing's Development Management Development Plan Document (adopted December 2013); or Policies 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6 of The London Plan: The Spatial Development Strategy for London-Consolidated with Alterations since 2011 (adopted March 2016); or the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework); or the London Plan Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (adopted November 2012) . Taken together, and amongst other matters, the policies and guidance seek to ensure that new development is complementary to the street sequence, building pattern, scale, materials and detailing of its surrounding built area, and host building.
10. As I have been supplied with no substantive evidence to suggest that the appeal building or its surroundings are either heritage assets, or within the Uxbridge Road/Crossrail corridor, I consider that Policies 1.2 (g) and 2.1(c) of the Development Strategy are inapplicable to this case.

Conditions

11. I have not been supplied with a list of suggested conditions by the Council in respect of the proposed development. Bearing in mind the tests given in paragraph 206 of the Framework, and the Government's Planning Practice Guidance I have however, in the interests of certainty, attached a condition which specifies the approved plans. In order that the proposed development is sensitive to the character and appearance of its host building I have also attached a condition requiring the use of matching materials in its external construction.

Conclusion

12. The proposed development would not conflict with the development plan insofar as the policies that have been drawn to my attention are concerned. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

G J Fort

INSPECTOR