



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2020

by Jonathon Parsons MSc BSc(Hons) DipTP Cert(Urb) MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/19/3243976

27 Ridings, Ealing W5 3BT

- 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 Mrs Salima Mahraoui against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 193544HH, dated 8 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 October 2019.
 - The development is front doors and associated alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The front doors and associated alterations have been completed and the appeal has been considered on this basis. The above description of the development has omitted the word 'retention', detailed in the application form, because it does not describe the nature of the development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the development preserves or enhances the character or the appearance of the Hanger Hill (Haymills Estate) Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two storey detached dwelling which is an example of a largely unchanged Neo-Georgian type house dating from around 1937. The frontage has a vehicle parking area and a stepped raised terrace which is hard surfaced. The surrounding area comprises a mixture of different dwellings types which are similarly set back from the road in spacious plots. There is established landscaping within plots and along the highway in verges. The area is within the Hanger Hill (Haymills Estate) Conservation Area. An Article 4 Direction removes permitted development rights for alterations to dwellings, including to the frontages.
5. This Conservation Area contains post 1930s suburban dwellings which are sited on a concentric ring road layout on the slope of Hanger Hill. The Hanger Hill (Haymills) Estate Conservation Area Character Appraisal 2008 details building works for the estate started in 1928, continued until 1930, and was largely completed before the start of the Second World War. The estate has a mix of

architectural model styles, including Modern, mock Tudor and neo-Georgian. Each style has a further number of variants. Houses have been altered and extended, but nevertheless, attractive original frontage detailing, materials and articulation, including porches, bays, windows and gables, remain and stand out. These historic and architectural qualities form defining characteristics and are of significance and value, and are of special interest to the Conservation Area.

6. The appeal dwelling has largely retained many of its original frontage features, including bays and windows. Prior to the erection of frontage doors, it would have had a recessed open porch with an internal front facing window and a hidden entrance door to one side. Such qualities positively contribute to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
7. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
8. With the new development, the original recessed window and hidden entrance door has been retained. However, the recessed open porch space has been lost and enclosed with a substantial sized entrance feature, comprising two timber doors with ornamental circular glass inserts and surrounds. Such an alteration results in the loss of a feature important to the architectural integrity of the dwelling and the contribution that it makes to qualities of the Conservation Area. Furthermore, its replacement with an imposing, ill-proportioned and overly fussy door feature is out of keeping with the style of the house. Given the importance of differing house model styles, it adversely affects the historic and architectural suburban qualities of the Conservation Area.
9. There have been frontage alterations to dwellings within the Conservation Area which involve infilling of original porch spaces and new large doors. There are examples drawn to my attention in the appellant's appeal statement. However, there are many dwellings with retained original features and the examples only form a small proportion of the overall number of dwellings within the Conservation Area which covers many streets. Notwithstanding this, the examples do not portray qualities that contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area. They further serve to confirm the harm that is arising from inappropriate alterations to dwellings in the Conservation Area. Additionally, it is also unclear whether these other examples have been subject to planning permission. Accordingly, the weight to be attached to these examples is limited in this assessment.
10. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) makes clear, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be.
11. In accordance with the Framework, the type of harm identified above would be less than substantial. It is necessary that this identified harm is weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The door design would provide an additional layer of security to the house. The estate has been subject to a huge rise in crime in recent years and the appeal property has been subject to break ins and burglary. The fear of crime has affected the quality of life of the appellant's family and neighbours. However, there is an adverse impact on the

Conservation Area for which considerable importance and weight is required to be attached. Additionally, it has not been demonstrated that the original front entrance to the dwelling was a significant security risk and if it was, whether alternative security measures could have been put in place. Thus, the harm to the significance of the Conservation Area outweighs any possible scheme benefits.

12. For all these reasons, the development fails to preserve the character and appearance of the Hanger Hill (Haymills Estate) Conservation Area. Accordingly, the scheme conflicts with Policy 1.1 of Ealing Core Strategy (CS) 2012, Policies 7.4, 7B and 7C of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD) 2013 and Policies 3.5, 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan (LP) 2016, which collectively and amongst other matters seek to require alterations to be well related to the existing character of the area in terms of historic and architectural quality and either preserve or enhance the character and appearance of a Conservation Area.

Conclusion

13. The scheme harms the character and appearance of the area in conflict with CS, DPD and LP policies and the development plan taken as a whole. For the reasons indicated, there are no material considerations to outweigh that finding. Having regard to all other matters raised, including support, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathon Parsons

INSPECTOR