
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 May 2017

by Mike Worden BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22nd May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/17/3168257
21 Sandall Road, Ealing W5 1HZ

- 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 and Mrs A. Wong against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 165519HH, dated 27 October 2016 was refused by notice dated 22 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as a '*loft conversion*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the alteration of roof from hip to gable end; rear roof extension (involving the conversion of roof space to habitable use) and installation of two roof lights to front roof slope at 21 Sandall Road , Ealing, W5 1HZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 165519HH, dated 27 October 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: 888 21/08, 888 21 05, 888 21 06, 888-21 03, 888- 21 01, 888-21 02, 888 21 04 and 888 21 07.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council has amended the description of the proposed development from that set out on the application form to: Alteration of roof from hip to gable end; rear roof extension (involving the conversion of roof space to habitable use) and installation of two roof lights to front roof slope. I consider this to be a clearer and more accurate description of what is being proposed. I have referred to the Council's amended description in this decision.
3. The appellants have made reference to revised plans¹ in their grounds of appeal but I have no such plans before me. In addition, the Council Officer's report and the decision notice make it clear that the application was determined having regard to the plans originally submitted with the application. This is acknowledged by the appellants who go on to confirm that their

¹ Plans 04A, 05A and 07A as referred to in the Grounds of Appeal

representations are directed to the original plans only. In determining this appeal I have only considered the plans before me which are those originally submitted with the application.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the property and whether it would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Brunswick Conservation Area

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached house which lies in an area of similar properties within the Brunswick Conservation Area. The houses date mainly from the 1930s and the generally quiet suburban character of the immediate area contrasts with the nearby busy roads of the North Circular and A40 (Western Avenue) and the higher rise and commercial development within their corridors.
6. The Council has prepared a management plan for the Conservation Area, the Brunswick Conservation Area Management Plan (BCAMP). The significance of the Conservation Area stems from its historical contribution to the development of London suburbs in the 1930s and in particular its association with outward growth related to the opening of Western Avenue. The appeal property is of a type of design specifically highlighted within the BCAMP as being found within the Conservation Area. The detailing, gables over the first floor front primary windows, hipped roofs and other elements, are features of this particular 'Brunswick' type of house.
7. Many of the houses within the Conservation Area have been extended from their original form, with a number having roof extensions. There are different designs and sizes of such extensions and the pattern of altered roof shapes and rear dormers have become part of the character of the area, whether or not these alterations were undertaken prior to, or since, the designation of the Conservation Area or the preparation of the BCAMP.
8. The appellant has also drawn my attention to the recent of granting planning permission of roof extensions within the Conservation Area, such as at 130 Sandall Road. This demonstrates that there will continue to be change to the roof pattern in the Conservation Area, as acceptable alterations are implemented.
9. Number 21 Sandall Road currently retains its original hipped roof shape. Roof extensions with rear dormers have taken place at the houses either side. Number 23 has been subject to a roof extension to form a large gable, whilst the one at number 19, which is the adjoining semi-detached house to the appeal site, is smaller. Number 25 has a large two storey side extension and a different roof pattern entirely as a result. The roof of number 17 remains unaltered.
10. The proposed development would extend the roof to form a gable at the side, create a dormer extension at the rear and introduce roof lights on the front slope of the house roof. I shall deal with these elements in turn.
11. The gable would be stepped down from the ridge at the front with the aim of maintaining the sense of the hip feature of the house. This would be larger

and of a different design to the extension at number 19 but would still be reasonably sympathetic to the roof design of the original house. It would mean that the hip feature of the original house design would still be evident when 19 and 21 Sandall Road are viewed as a pair from the street providing a degree of balance. I conclude therefore that the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the property.

12. The proposal would mean that there would be a series of different roof shapes along the side of Sandall Road between number 25 and number 17. However within the immediate area, in Sandall Road, Brunswick Road and Brunswick Gardens, a variety of different shaped roofs can be seen from the street and there is not a particularly defined rhythm of similar styles.
13. The proposal would introduce a flat roofed dormer on to the extended rear roof. This would be of a different size and design to the dormers on the properties either side, but would be stepped in from the edge of the extended roof. From my site visit I could see a number of rear dormers of different design and sizes within the immediate area and it is clear that rear dormers have become part of the established character of the area.
14. The rear garden of the appeal property backs on to the properties on Brunswick Road and there is a significant amount of established landscaping in many of the rear gardens. The rear roof of the appeal property is not particularly evident from street level on Brunswick Gardens or Brunswick Road and can only be seen in occasional glimpses between houses. In any case, since rear dormers are now a feature in the area, the proposed dormer would not be an uncharacteristic form of development.
15. I agree with the Council that the proposed roof lights in the front roof slope are not harmful to the character and appearance of the property or the Conservation Area and that they preserve its appearance and character.
16. In the light of this, I conclude that the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the house, and that it would preserve the character and appearance of the Brunswick Conservation Area. I consider that the proposed development would accord with Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan 2015, which require good design and the protection of heritage assets, and Policies 7.4, 7B and 7C of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document 2013 which seek to ensure that development reflects local character, is of good design and conserves the character of a conservation area. In reaching this conclusion I have also had regard to the BCAMP, the Council's Supplementary Planning Document SP4 which provides guidance on house extensions, and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Conditions

17. I consider that in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework, two conditions need to be imposed. These are the standard condition limiting the lifespan of the planning permission; and a condition specifying the approved plans in the interests of certainty and clarity. The materials which are proposed to be used are set out on Plan number 888-21 07 and therefore I do not consider there is a need for a separate materials condition in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Mike Worden

INSPECTOR