

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2021

**by J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 15<sup>th</sup> March 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/20/3255681**

**45 Woodfield Crescent, Ealing, London W5 1PB**

- 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 R Parker against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
  - The application Ref 201729HH, dated 1 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 July 2020.
  - The development proposed is loft extension incorporating sky-light and dormer window.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft extension incorporating sky-light and dormer window at 45 Woodfield Crescent, Ealing, London W5 1PB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 201729HH, dated 1 April 2020 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: 45WC:P2.02, 45WC:P2.03, 45WC:P2.01 Rev C, 45WC:S.01 Rev A, 45WC:S.02 and 45WC:S.04.
  - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan No 45WC:P2.01 Rev C.

### Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form. The Council's decision notice describes the proposal as 'two dormer windows to rear roof slope, installation of one rooflight to rear roof slope', but neither party has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Moreover, while it would include two windows separated by a central recess, the plans show that the dormer would comprise a single structure, rather than two dormers as the Council's description suggests. I have therefore used the original description of development in my formal decision.
3. The London Plan 2021 (LP) was adopted on 2 March 2021. The LP supersedes policies of the London Plan - The Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011 referred to within the Council's reason for refusal, but with regard to the circumstances of the appeal before me, it does not raise fresh considerations necessitating further comment by the parties in this case.

## **Main Issue**

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Brentham Garden Estate Conservation Area (CA).

## **Reasons**

5. The appeal dwelling is located within the Brentham Garden Estate CA. It is part of a terrace comprising dwellings of generally consistent scale and matching designs, with common design elements to the fronts of the buildings including arched entrance porches, shared gables, contrasting brick and render finishes, and regularly arranged windows and doors of like proportions. There is also a fairly regular pattern and roofscape to the rear of the terrace owing to the repeated sequence of two-storey rear outriggers and prominent chimneys, albeit that rooflights and dormers to some of the dwellings are apparent, including from the street scene of Brunner Road. As a result, there is an attractive sense of uniformity, and together with the gradual stepping in the building line along the street this provides for a distinctive visual rhythm and coherence to the terrace. I find therefore that the appeal dwelling and terrace as a whole make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA, and to its significance which derives in part from the consistency of architectural approach to different buildings.
6. Guidance on dormers within the Council's Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) includes that they should be designed so that they do not appear unduly obtrusive or dominant, and should respect the character of the original dwelling. They should be set down at least 0.5m from the ridge of the roof, and in conservation areas, the SPD notes that traditional designs are required. The Brentham Garden Estate CA Management Plan 2008 (CAMP) notes that dormers may be acceptable on the rear roof slopes, but further advises that they should not dominate the roof slope, and should generally copy existing historic examples in the CA.
7. The Council advises that the height of the proposed dormer would be less than 0.5m below the ridge, but there would nevertheless be a discernible set down, and its height and position would be consistent with the dormer to the attached neighbour at 44 Woodfield Crescent. It would include two windows and would be wider than the dormer to No 44 and other single-window dormers within the terrace. Even so, there would still be significant spacing to the sides of the roof, and the dormer would be set well back from the eaves leaving much of the overall roof slope unaffected. I am therefore satisfied that the dormer would be proportionate to the host roof as a whole, and the central recess would also serve to break up the appearance of the scale of the dormer. In my view, its scale or position would not be dominant or interrupt the overall rhythm of the roofscape, and I consider that a departure from the detailed guidelines within the SPD is in this case justified.
8. Moreover, views of the dormer would be much restricted by its position within the terrace where outrigger projections along the run would provide for screening of the rear roof slope. The development would not be readily apparent from surrounding street scenes, and the visual impact and effect of the proposal on the appearance of the CA would accordingly be limited. While there would be views from some neighbouring gardens, the scale of the dormer would not be inconsistent with varied roof additions to nearby buildings within the CA, including examples that I observed from the appeal site to the rear of

Woodfield Avenue. Other dormers within the terrace additionally differ in their positioning within the host roof slopes. Given also the external materials and glazing design which would be consistent with nearby examples, I do not find that the dormer would be prominent or out of keeping against the established character of the area.

9. Given the limited scale of the proposed rooflight and its design within the rear roof slope, I also agree with the Council that it would not cause harm to the CA, and even taken together with the dormer I do not consider that the level of fenestration proposed would dominate or overwhelm the host roof.
10. I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Brentham Garden Estate CA in accordance with s72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. However, with regard to the specific circumstances of the appeal site and taking the above factors together, I find that the dormer would not be disproportionate or excessive against the host or surrounding buildings, and that it would be a discreet addition within the area. I therefore conclude that the character and the appearance of the CA would be preserved.
11. As a consequence, I find no conflict with Policies 7.4, 7B or 7C of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document 2013 which together broadly require a high standard of design which compliments its surroundings and which conserves and enhances heritage assets, nor with Policy D4 of the LP which relates to delivering good design. The proposal would also accord with the thrust of guidance within the SPD and CAMP seeking extensions that are sympathetic and the preservation or enhancement of the CA, as well as requirements within the National Planning Policy Framework highlighting the importance of well-designed places and the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.

### **Conditions**

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of certainty. A condition to control the external materials of the development is also necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. However, the proposed lead cladding to the dormer would not match the existing roof of the appeal dwelling, and so for the sake of clarity I have amended the Council's suggested condition to refer to the use of materials as shown on the submitted plans.

### **Conclusion**

13. I find that the proposal would accord with the development plan when it is read as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that a decision contrary to the development plan should be reached. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*J Bowyer*

**INSPECTOR**