
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 January 2020

by Neil Smith BA Hons BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/3240170

8 Ashbourne Close, Ealing W5 3EF

- 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 M P Unarket against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 192789HH, dated 24 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is windows and door replacement on the front and right side elevations of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed replacement windows and doors would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hanger Hill (Haymills) Estate Conservation Area (CA) set within generous plots.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling. Ashbourne Close is a cul-de-sac which is characterised by large dwellings with three to five bedrooms. The dwellings have front garden areas and low boundary walls with planting allowing views of the front elevations.
4. The appeal property is in the Hanger Hill (Haymills) Estate CA, a designated heritage asset. The dominant architectural character of this part of the estate is that of typically 1930's 'suburban' type detached and semi-detached housing. The dwellings have hipped roofs, double height bay windows or windows with small square panes within the main glazing fields, gables and a variety of architectural elements associated with neo-Georgian and mock-Tudor. The appeal property displays some of these characteristics and makes a positive contribution to the CA.
5. The appeal proposal is for the replacement of the existing windows to the front and side elevation; which are made from a combination of timber and aluminium; with white uPVC double glazed casement windows. The existing timber door would also be replaced, with a white composite door with a woodgrain textured finish.

6. UPVC is a material that has an artificial texture and a more uniform finish, when new and when ageing, than painted timber windows and doors. It would still be possible to discern the appeal proposal as modern insertions that would be incongruous intrusions into the historic setting.
7. The appellant argues that the windows would be of the same pane arrangement as the existing windows; would improve the habitable accommodation and improve energy efficiency and security. However, none of these matters either alter or outweigh the harm identified to the CA. The appellant has also drawn my attention to the differing styles and materials of the windows used in the neighbouring properties. However, I do not have the full details of these schemes and I cannot be certain of any direct comparison to the appeal proposal. In any event, I have determined this appeal on its own planning merits.
8. The Council has produced the Hanger Hill (Haymills) Estate CA Management Plan (CAMP) (March 2008). It states that the preference is for traditional, renewable materials and in cases where appropriate, against the use of architectural elements and fenestration details in PVC-U or other manufactured substitutes.
9. The appeal proposal, by reason of its detailed design and use of materials would result in an incompatible form of development, poorly related to and at odds with the established and historic pattern of development in this area. The statutory duty in Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is a matter of considerable importance and weight. The development would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the CA. This weighs considerably against the proposal.
10. The proposal would have a detrimental effect on the significance of a designated heritage asset and would result in 'less than substantial' harm under paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
11. The Framework requires such harm to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The proposal is for replacement windows and front door, which would provide a very modest contribution to the housing stock. The public benefits would not outweigh the less than substantial harm.
12. It would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA and therefore conflicts with Policies 7.4 and 7B of the London Borough of Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) and the CAMP, which require, amongst other things, development in Ealing's existing built areas to complement materials characteristic of the local area.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Neil Smith

INSPECTOR