



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2019

by J Williamson BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/19/3232370

36 Brentvale Avenue, Southall UB1 3ER

- 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 S Kukran against the decision of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 190941HH, dated 28 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2019.
 - The development is rear dormer roof extension; side roof extension from hip to gable end and raising of roof ridge line.
-

Procedural Matters

1. The description of development provided on the application form is "retention of roof ridge height". The description of development provided on the appeal form is "retention of rear dormer roof extension; side roof extension from hip to gable end and raising of roof ridge line".
2. The appeal form states that the description has not been changed from that stated on the application form although it evidently has. The description of development provided on the Council's decision notice is the same as that provided by the appellant on the appeal form, which is essentially the description provided by the Council in the acknowledgement letter sent to the appellant following submission of the planning application. With the removal of the phrase "retention of", I have used this description of development as it more accurately describes the development than that provided on the application form, which only refers to raising the roof ridge and doesn't include the dormer or hip to gable extensions.
3. It is clear from the description of development that a first-floor side/rear extension, clearly visible on the plans and on site, does not form part of the development of concern, even though reference is made to it within the reason for refusal. The Officer Report (OR) indicates that planning permission was granted, under application ref 178888HH, for a first-floor side/rear extension, which has been implemented. If the Council considers that what has been constructed does not accord with the approved plans, then this could be addressed by utilising relevant enforcement powers.
4. I observed that the development described above has already been carried out, and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Decision

5. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rear dormer roof extension; side roof extension from hip to gable end and raising of roof ridge line at 36 Brentvale Avenue, Southall UB1 3ER, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 190941HH, dated 28 February 2019, which included plans P/3601, P/3602, P/3603 and P/3604.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

7. The application site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located on the northern side of Brentvale Avenue, opposite the junction with Wharncliffe Drive. Given its location, the property and its adjoining semi-detached dwelling are publicly visible from Uxbridge Road, a main road that is at the opposite end of Wharncliffe Drive to Brentvale Avenue.
8. The broad residential area within which the application site is located consists of Brentvale Avenue, Wharncliffe Road, Blackmore Avenue and properties fronting Uxbridge Road, either side of Wharncliffe Drive. This residential development is characterised by mainly two-storey, terraced properties with a small number of semi-detached dwellings.
9. Many of the properties have bay windows extending off the front elevations with hipped gable roofs. Several have porches or canopies on the front elevations with mainly mono-pitched roofs. A number of the properties have been extended and altered, consisting of extensions to the front, side and rear, rear dormers and skylights in roof slopes. Several have replaced original roof tiles with new ones, resulting in a clearly distinct change in colour between the roof tiles of one property and those of its neighbour. The roof lines of the terraced rows tend to consist of roof ridges for one or two of the dwellings in the terrace, of varying heights, sometimes as a consequence of the contours of the street, rather than one long ridge of the same height across the entire terrace. The differences in height, as perceived from ground level, appear to vary between approximately 0.1 m to 0.2 m.
10. The Council's key concern with the development is the increased height of the roof ridge, which it considers results in a loss of symmetry between the semi-detached properties, which it deems to be discordant.
11. However, the plans show that the height of increase in height of the ridge is only 150 mm, which is similar to the variation in ridge heights between properties in the neighbouring terraced rows. Furthermore, there is a chimney positioned on the party wall between the 2 semi-detached properties, located in the centre of the original roof ridge line, which screens the view of the actual variation in ridge heights between the 2 properties when viewed from both the eastern and western ends of Brentvale Avenue.
12. The variation in colour between the new roof tiles of the appeal property and the old tiles of the adjoining semi is very similar to the variation that exists on other properties in the area where new roof tiles have been installed. I acknowledge that the site and its adjoining semi are in a prominent position as

they can be seen from Uxbridge Road and as one walks down Wharncliffe Road. However, within the context of this residential area and the roof detailing of surrounding properties, as described above, I consider that the very modest increase in ridge height is not perceived as being incongruous within the streetscene, out of keeping with the host property or discordant with the neighbouring semi-detached property. As such, I conclude that the development does not harm the character or appearance of the area.

13. In light of the above, the development accords with policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document, 2013, (EDMDPD) 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (LP), and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which, collectively, and amongst other things, seek to ensure developments provide high quality architectural and urban design, complement existing building patterns, their scale and detailing, are visually attractive and sympathetic to the local character.
14. I note that Supplementary Planning Document 4 (Residential Extensions) (SPD) advises that the ridge of a dwelling should not be raised, in order to protect the proportion of a dwelling and the character and uniformity of the streetscene. In this instance I have concluded that the character of the streetscene is one of varying roof ridge heights, that the increase of 150mm is a modest increase that would not affect the proportion of the dwelling, and as such the development will not harm the relationship with the adjoining semi-detached property, streetscene or character of the area. As such, the proposal adheres to the objectives of the SPD, which is a material consideration, as well as adhering to the EDMDPD and LP policies, which are the primary policies against which the development is assessed.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons outlined above the appeal is allowed.

J Williamson

INSPECTOR