



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 23 February 2021

by William Cooper BA (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/19/3243698

38 Clarendon Road, London W5 1AB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Siavash Daryoush-Shirazi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref: 193327HH, dated 23 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey detached garden outbuilding for use as granny annexe following demolition of existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The decision in the banner heading above is taken from the appeal form and decision notice as it is more succinct than that shown on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is whether the character or appearance of the Brunswick Conservation Area (CA) would be preserved or enhanced.

Reasons

4. The CA covers a residential area, at the core of which is an approximately triangular shaped estate that is delineated by Sandall Road and part of Brunswick Road and Lynwood Road. Its character is shaped by rows of predominantly semi-detached, two-storey 1930s housing of striking black and white half-timbered style, which is known as 'Stockbroker's Tudor'. The typical roofscape of tiled main hip roofs with cross gabled elements further contributes to the traditional character of the area.
5. Dwellings are set among a 'green framework' of garden space and public greenspace. This space, along with the separation gaps between pairs of dwellings contributes to architectural 'breathing space' around the houses. This contributes to a distinctive sense of spatial balance in the CA. As set out in section 7.1 of the Brunswick Conservation Area Character Appraisal, the footprint and scale of houses and garages and the gaps in between, as well as the substantial gardens at the rear, are vital to the character of the CA.
6. Judging by what I saw during my site visit and the evidence before me, the CA's significance lies in its illustration of 'lavish traditional' interwar 'superior suburbia' townscape, through its architectural form, materials and spacing.

7. More modern alterations such as extensions and uPVC windows have brought pressure to bear on the heritage appearance of some properties. Nevertheless, the rhythm and repetition of heritage elements described above enables the core historic identity of the CA to shine through.
8. The appeal property comprises a substantial two-storey semi-detached dwelling, its garden areas and a garage. The house is of the interwar 'Stockbroker's Tudor' style, with red brick walls on the ground floor and white render finish to the first floor. The front elevation also has the distinctive timber framing at first floor level. Other street-facing features typical of the area's heritage character include mixed hip and dual-pitch gable roofscape, and oriel windows mounted on jettied bays. This combination of form and features along with the property's front and back garden space, contributes to the 'superior suburbia' townscape of the CA.
9. The dwelling is located on an L shaped plot near the junction of Sandall Road and Clarendon Road. The southern leg of the L, which includes the garage, faces onto a brow of Sandall Road. The other leg comprises the front of the dwelling which faces onto Clarendon Road. The latter is a key axis within the CA, with the two sides of the street facing a central green strip. The above factors contribute to the property's prominence within the CA.
10. Within this context, the appeal property contributes positively to the significance of the CA through the traditional architectural elements of the house and its garden space.
11. The proposal would remove the property's concrete garage building which faces onto a stretch of the northern side of Sandall Road. This stretch mainly comprises walled and fenced side boundaries of rear gardens, facing semi-detached dwelling frontages on the south side of the street. The garage sits in the middle of a row of three garages. The existing garage is plain and worn in appearance and not especially picturesque.
12. The L shape of the property's rear garden and the neighbouring outbuilding to the rear of No. 40 Clarendon Road would go some way to reduce the visibility of the proposed outbuilding.
13. However, the following combination of factors would be discordant with the traditional townscape of the CA. The proposed outbuilding would have an atypical mono-pitched roof profile facing onto Sandall Road. It would entail a substantial step up in scale of outbuilding on the appeal site. Its approximately 93sq.m footprint would sit further forward towards the street on Sandall Road than the neighbouring outbuilding at No. 40 Clarendon Road. It would also substantially exceed the latter's outbuilding footprint.
14. It is undisputed that the proposed outbuilding would be modern in appearance. The absence of a dual-pitched roof profile and 'Stockbroker Tudor' styling would fail to achieve a pairing of appearance with the front elevation of No. 40's outbuilding. The roofing material would not be demonstrably sympathetic to local character. Moreover, the raised rooflights, expanse and uncharacteristic pattern of fenestration and residential use of the outbuilding - including an independent access onto Sandall Road - would further draw attention to the proposal's lack of subordinate and contextually sympathetic outbuilding character. The use of modern double glazed uPVC or aluminium windows and

external doors would further draw attention to the proposal's discordance with the heritage essence of the CA.

15. Therefore, in accumulation with the neighbouring outbuildings' mass, the proposal would result in an uncharacteristic modern outbuilding bulk that would disrupt the spatial balance of the CA. It would also contrast awkwardly with the interwar 'superior suburbia' essence of the CA. The above effects would be noticeable to various degrees viewed from the street on Sandall Road, the appeal property and other properties in the vicinity.
16. As such, the proposal would undermine the objective that development should be sympathetic to its context in the CA, as set out in paragraph 4.1.5 of the Brunswick Conservation Area Management Plan (CAMP). It would also conflict with paragraphs 5.4.1 and 5.4.7 of the CAMP in respect of rooflight and outbuilding design.
17. The identified harm would not be negated by the use of planning conditions, for example in relation to window frame and door colouring, and ancillary use.
18. My attention is drawn to other developments which have been granted planning permission. These differ from the current appeal proposal in various ways. They are on different sites, some of which are not within the Brunswick CA. Some entail conversion of an existing building. This limits the extent to which the other cases are analogous to the current appeal proposal. Furthermore, the appeal proposal has its own setting and circumstances and, as such, I assess this case on its own merits.
19. The identified harm arising from the proposal would be significant, relative to the site and the immediate surroundings of the proposal in the CA. However, the effect would be localised and therefore would constitute less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA as a whole. In such circumstances I therefore necessarily weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal.
20. With regard to the above, the proposal would provide new two-bedroom, wheelchair accessible living accommodation with disability-friendly fittings. An unsympathetic garage building would be removed from the CA. However, the public benefits in these respects are limited by the scale of the development proposed. Consequently, the public benefits do not outweigh the great weight given to the conservation of the CA and the less than substantial harm to its significance which I have identified.
21. To conclude, the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. As such, it would conflict with Policies 7C and 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan¹. Together the policies seek to ensure that development is of appropriate design and appearance to conserve or enhance local character and the historic environment. The policies are broadly consistent with the approach of the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, with great weight given to the asset's conservation.

¹ The London Plan: The Spatial Development Strategy for London, Consolidated with Alterations since 2011, March 2016.

Conclusion

22. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

William Cooper

INSPECTOR