



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2017

by Helen Cassini BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 06 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/17/3180659

77 Highview Road, West Ealing W13 0HL

- 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 Ms J Henshaw against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref: 171391HH, dated 21 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is the alteration of roof from hip to gable ends, rear roof extension incorporating Juliet balcony and installation of 3 roof lights to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the alteration of roof from hip to gable ends, rear roof extension incorporating Juliet balcony and installation of 3 roof lights to front roof slope at 77 Highview Road, West Ealing W13 0HL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 171391HH, dated 21 March 2017, 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 Plan 1:500; Site Location Plan 1:1250; Existing Floor Plans Dwg No: 01; Existing/Proposed Elevations Dwg No: 02; Existing/Proposed Elevations Dwg No: 03; Proposed 1st Floor Plan Dwg No: 04; Proposed 2nd Floor Plan Dwg No: 05; Proposed Longitudinal Section Y-Y Dwg No: 06.
 - 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 host building, in respect of materials, colour, texture, profile; and in the case of brickwork, the facebond and pointing, and thereafter retained.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the proposal has been taken from the Council's decision notice, as it provides a full and accurate description of the development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on the western side of Highview Road, close to the junction with Rosemount Road. The host dwelling is a relatively large, two-storey detached dwelling. The character of the surrounding area is predominately residential, with evidence of a variety of architectural styles and designs. From observations made during the site visit a number of dwellings in proximity to the appeal site have undergone, or are undergoing, renovation and extension works similar to the appeal scheme.
5. The proposed development consists of roof alterations, a rear roof extension and three roof lights to the front roof slope. I have had regard to the fall-back position whereby a similar scheme could be built under permitted development rights. Limited detail has been provided in regard to the fall-back scheme. However, it is considered that the appeal scheme would not have a materially greater impact than the fall-back scheme. Accordingly, the fall-back position has been given significant weight.
6. In addition, at the time of the site visit, scaffolding had been erected in preparation for commencement of construction. As such, it is evident that should the current appeal fail, it is extremely likely that the appellant will seek to implement the fall-back position, which is therefore material to the consideration of the appeal scheme.
7. The design of the host dwelling is unique within the immediate locality. Nevertheless, dwellings with gable roofs are features of the character of both the immediate street scene and in the wider area. As such, it is not considered that the introduction of gable roofing would represent an alien or overly intrusive design feature. In addition, the proposed roof alteration would remain a subordinate feature of the host dwelling.
8. The majority of the proposed rear dormer would not be visible from within the public realm on Highview Road. However, due to the presence of a public footpath running adjacent to the boundary of the host dwelling and 75 Highview Road, the dormer would be visible to those users of the footpath, occupiers of No 75 and also dwellings which face the rear of the dwelling on Kingsley Avenue.
9. Despite the visibility, rear dormers are existing features of the character of the locality. Moreover, the dormer would be set down from the ridge line and in from both the roof sides and eaves, and would occupy a central location on the roof slope. Accordingly, the dormer would be an appropriate addition to the roof slope and would appear as a subservient feature in terms of both the roof slope and host dwelling.
10. Turning my attention to the proposed roof lights, they would be visible within the public realm. However, given the relatively low profile and the existing presence of such features within the surrounding area, they would preserve the existing character of the locality.
11. On the basis of the above, and taking into consideration the fall-back position, the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the surrounding area. For these reasons, the proposal complies with the Policies 1.1(g) and 1.2 (f) of the London Borough of Ealing Development Strategy 2026 Development Plan Document 2012, Policies 7.4 and 7B of the London Borough of Ealing

Development Management Development Plan Document 2013 and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan 2016. Taken together these policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure development respects the existing local character and is of a high quality design.

Conditions

12. The conditions suggested by the Council have been considered against the tests of the National Planning Policy Framework and advice provided by the Planning Practice Guidance. The majority are found to be reasonable and necessary in the circumstances of this case, although minor amendments to the wording have been necessary in the interests of precision and clarity.
13. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans in order to provide certainty. A condition relating to materials is appropriate in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.
14. The Council also requested a condition relating to the obscure glazing and opening of the windows in the side elevations facing 75 and 79 Highview Road, in the interests of the protection of residential amenity. However, the proposed window in the southern elevation would overlook public land and the window in the northern elevation would face a blank, brick elevation. It is not therefore considered necessary to impose such control via a condition in this instance.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that, subject to conditions, the appeal should be allowed.

Helen Cassini

INSPECTOR