



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2021

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 JANUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/21/3281427

35 Queen Annes Gardens, LONDON, W5 5QD

- 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 Andrew Mcauley against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 213436HH, dated 4 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is the alteration of roof from hip to gable end; the construction of a rear roof extension incorporating a Juliet balcony; the installation of two rooflights to the front roofslope; and the construction of a two-storey side extension (following demolition of the existing side extension) including a roof balcony to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the alteration of roof from hip to gable end; the construction of a rear roof extension incorporating a Juliet balcony; the installation of two rooflights to the front roofslope; and the construction of a two-storey side extension (following demolition of the existing side extension) including a roof balcony to the rear at 35 Queen Annes Gardens, LONDON, W5 5QD, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 213436HH, dated 4 May 2021, and the plans submitted with it, 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: Location Plan; drawings (survey) ref: 2007/3/03. 04 and 05; drawings (proposed) ref: 2007/3/01, 12, 13, and 04.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extensions and alterations on the character and appearance of the area along Queen Annes Gardens.

Reasons

3. No 35 is a semi-detached house situated at the southern end of Queen Annes Gardens, and at the western end of the row of houses that form the head of the cul-de-sac. To the west of the property is the extensive Ascott Allotments and to the south is the Piccadilly Underground Line. The house has a small single-storey side extension and a small rear garden. The proposed development would involve the replacement of the existing side extension with a two-storey extension. It would also include construction of a rear dormer with a balcony to the side, above the proposed side extension. The principle of a hip-to-gable alteration, the rear dormer and construction of a replacement single-storey side extension was accepted by way of a planning permission in 2018. Materials to be used would match those existing.
4. Policy 7.4 of the Council's Development Management DPD (DPD) indicates that development in Ealing's existing built areas should complement their street sequence, building pattern, scale, materials, and detailing. Policy 7B indicates that new development must achieve a high level of amenity for users and adjacent users by ensuring that, amongst other things, there is coherent development of the site, a positive visual impact, and external treatments which complement the building and context.
5. The Council contends that the proposed development by reason of its design, appearance and scale, would constitute an incongruous, un-neighbourly and unsympathetic development, to the detriment of visual and residential amenity, and the character of the dwellinghouse and that of the surrounding area and street scene.
6. The appellant contends that the proposed two-storey side extension would appear subordinate to the existing house, that it would continue the existing front roof pitch, and that there are other nearby examples of two-storey side extensions which already result in unbalanced pairs of semi-detached houses.
7. In this case, the first-floor of the proposed side extension would be set back 1 metre from the front elevation of the house, and the roof pitch would be the same as that of the front slope of the existing main roof. The sloping roof of the extension would continue upwards for only a little over 1 metre in height and around 1.5 metres in depth, such that it would be around 2 metres below the main roof ridge at its highest point. Behind this roof element a balcony would be constructed to the side of the rear dormer, which would not be visible from the street. On this basis, I consider that the proposed development would appear subordinate to the main house. It would also, arguably, appear more coherent than the existing lean-to type of single-storey side extension.
8. I note that the two-storey side extensions to houses in close proximity to No 35 both have hipped roofs. Nevertheless, both result in unbalanced pairs of houses without detriment to the overall street scene. One of these extensions, that at No 21, is at the opposite end of the head of the cul-de-sac from the appeal property. From my site visit, it would appear that there are a number of unbalanced pairs of houses along the road as a result of hip-to-gable roof alterations. Also, Nos 7, 15 and 14 have uncharacteristic side/rear dormers. Finally, I note that the corner plot at No 24 has a gable end fronting the head of the cul-de-sac, and that No 26 is a small detached house of more modern design with a gable end directly facing the appeal property.

9. In the light of the above, I consider that the proposed development at No 35 would not result in an appearance unsympathetic or out of character with the rest of Queen Annes Gardens, which already exhibits significant variety around the basic design of the pairs of houses, and an uncharacteristic detached house at the same end of the head of the cul-de-sac as the appeal property. The side extension at No 35 would not be readily visible in the street scene, being set-back from the existing front elevation and set-down from the existing roof ridge of the house. The proposed hip-to-gable alteration and the rear dormer were recently approved in principle by the Council, and I concur with that view. The balcony would not be visible in the street scene.
10. On this basis, I find that the proposal would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the area along Queen Annes Gardens, and it would not, therefore, conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7B of the DPD. Accordingly, I allow the appeal.

Conditions

11. I have attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have attached a further condition relating to materials in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR