The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2021

by K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/21/3268813
253 Brunswick Road, Ealing, W5 1AJ

- 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 & Mrs N Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
- The application Ref 204692HH, dated 16 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 January 2021.
- The development proposed comprises the alteration of roof from hip to gable end; rear roof extension and installation of rooflights to front roof slope.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for roof extensions to rear and side of main roof slopes; alterations to (garage) outbuilding involving replacing flat roof with dual pitched roof, replacing door and window openings on (southeast) side elevation with two window openings, and replacement of window opening on rear elevation with double door opening; and installation of rooflights to front roof slope at 253 Brunswick Road, Ealing, W5 1AJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 204692HH, dated 16 November 2020, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2011-L-001, 2011-L-101, 2011-A-111, 2011-A-112, 2011-A-211, 2011-A-212, 2011-A-213, 2011-A-311.

   3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural matter

2. The Council amended the description of the proposed development from that set out on the application form to: Roof extensions to rear and side of main roof slopes; alterations to (garage) outbuilding involving replacing flat roof with dual pitched roof, replacing door and window openings on (southeast) side elevation with two window openings, and replacement of window opening on rear elevation with double door opening; and installation of rooflights to front roof

slope. I consider this to describe more accurately and completely the development proposed. I have therefore used this description in my decision.

Main Issue

3. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed roof extensions and garage alterations on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, its semi-detached pair, the streetscene of Brunswick Road and the Brunswick Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a traditional two storey, interwar semi-detached house with a hipped roof and wide, oversailing eaves. To the rear there is a single garage with a flat roof. The dwelling is set in a quiet, leafy, suburban street of mostly similar dwellings which lies within the Brunswick Conservation Area (CA). This is in stark contrast with the nearby arterial routes comprising the A40 (Western Avenue) and the A406 (North Circular).

5. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) makes clear that conservation areas are designated heritage assets. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, the NPPF advises that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Significance can be harmed through alteration of the heritage asset or development within its setting.

6. The Brunswick Conservation Area Management Plan (BCAMP), 2007, sets out the significance of the CA which is derived from its contribution to the spread of the London suburbs during the 1930s, particularly in this location in association with the development of the Western Avenue. The design of the appeal dwelling is highlighted in the BCAMP as being typical of the "Brunswick" type with detailing and a double height bay with feature gable to the front elevation as well as the characteristic hipped roof and wide eaves.

7. Roof alterations are numerous within the CA and exhibit a variety of different shapes and forms but owing to their number they have become characteristic of the CA. The Council points out that some extensions were completed before the CA was designated and before the BCAMP was prepared. Nevertheless, this does not alter the fact that they are now typical of the area. Moreover, the appellant has pointed out a number of roof extensions that have been permitted nearby since the designation of the CA, including at Nos 245, 263 and 130 Brunswick Road (although the permission at No 130 does not appear to have been implemented) and 21 Sandall Road. This demonstrates that the area continues to change and evolve.

8. The appeal dwelling and its semi-detached pair currently have unaltered roof forms. However, the unattached neighbour, No 251 has a full hip to gable roof. The proposed development comprises a side dormer that would finish in a ridge below the height of the existing main ridge and would be set in from the eaves. It would follow the pitch of the front roof slope but be set behind the existing hip, so as to preserve the characteristic roof line. The wide, oversailing eaves would also remain unaltered. Overall, it would comprise a sympathetic and subservient addition that would preserve the essential character and appearance of the dwelling and its semi-detached pair.

9. The side dormer would extend up from the rear hip and a flat roofed rear dormer would project from the extended plane of the rear roof slope, set in from the gable end of the side dormer, down from the ridge and up from the eaves so as to appear subservient. This would be comparable with other rear dormers nearby. The Council suggests that the proposed fenestration would not respect the pattern or hierarchy of the existing windows. However, windows would maintain the vertical emphasis of windows below, not all of which are original, and, in the rear dormer, step in from existing main windows. I therefore find them acceptable.

10. The site backs onto modern development associated with the Western Relief Road which lies outside the CA. I am satisfied that, owing to its scale and design together with the intervening distance and vegetation, the rear roof alterations and dormer would not appear out of character and would preserve views into the CA.

11. The proposed development includes two rooflights to the front elevation. The Council does not raise any objection to these but, together with third parties, suggests that they should be conservation rooflights. In principle, I agree that this would be desirable. However, there are numerous examples of front facing roof lights in the immediate vicinity of the appeal dwelling which are not conservation grade. I therefore consider that it would be unreasonable to require them in this case. Likewise, third parties object to the use of UPVC windows but as these would match windows in the existing dwelling, I do not find them unacceptable.

12. Turning to the proposed garage alterations, these comprise the addition of a dual pitched roof to match the original garage at No 251, the alteration of openings and the addition of rooflights in the elevation facing the garden of the appeal property. The Council does not object to these alterations and I agree that they would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. Third parties object to the proposed modern garage door but this would be inconspicuous in the street scene and similar to the existing door. I therefore find it acceptable.

13. It is concluded on the main issue that the proposed roof extensions and garage alterations would have no materially detrimental effect on the character or appearance of the host dwelling, its semi-detached pair, or the street scene of Brunswick Road and would preserve the character and appearance of the Brunswick CA. In consequence, there would be no conflict with Policies 7.4, 7B and 7C of the Ealing Development Management DPD, 2013, Policies D4, D6 and HC1 of the recently adopted London Plan, 2021, the NPPF, the BCAMP or the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 4 – Residential Extensions. Taken together these seek to ensure that, amongst other things, new development, including residential extensions, is visually attractive as a result of good architecture, sympathetic to local character and history and conserves the significance of heritage assets through sympathetic design that retains characteristic features and detailing.

14. In addition to the statutory commencement condition, the Council suggests four further conditions. I agree that, in order to protect the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area and for the avoidance of doubt, the development should be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and in materials that match those in the existing building. As

reasoned in paragraph 11 above, I do not consider it reasonable to require conservation rooflights in the front roof slope. Finally, the Council suggests that the side facing window should be obscure glazed. However, this illuminates the loft stairs and side windows in No 251 also appear to serve non-habitable areas. The use of obscure glazing would not therefore be necessary to protect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

15. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, including the representations of third parties, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

K E Down
INSPECTOR