
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2022

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 JANUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/21/3284665

120 Westcott Crescent, Hanwell W7 1PB

- The appeal is made under section 78A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr D Collison against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 214582HH, dated 5 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'alteration to roof from hip to gable-end; rear roof extension; single storey rear extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as it relates to the alteration to the roof from hip to gable-end and rear roof extension.
2. The appeal is allowed in so far as it relates to the single storey rear extension at 120 Westcott Crescent, Hanwell W7 1PB and planning permission is granted in accordance with the terms of the application Ref. 214582HH, dated 5 July 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans (in so far as they relate to the single storey rear extension) dated 17 March 2021 titled:

Site Plans, Block Plan, Ground Floor Plans, Roof Plan, Rear Elevation, East Elevation and West Elevation.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) No part of the roof of the extension hereby permitted shall be used as or altered to form a balcony, roof garden, roof terrace or similar amenity area.

Procedural Matters

3. The description of the development contained within the Application Form states '*retention of single storey rear extension*'. As the proposal also includes roof
-

alterations, I have taken the description from the Council's Decision Notice as this is more accurate, recognising that 'retention' is not, in itself, development.

4. The single storey rear extension was present at the time of my visit. This has no bearing on my decision which is based on the planning merits of the case.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the Cuckoo Estate Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

6. The appeal relates to a semi-detached dwelling which sits within a road of similar properties. A noticeable element of this particular part of the street scene is the consistent nature of the hipped roofs of the dwellings located within it, which makes a positive contribution to the overall character and appearance of the CA.
7. The proposal includes a single storey rear extension projecting some 3.7 meters from the original rear elevation of the host dwelling. I am mindful that the Cuckoo Conservation Area Management Plan 2007 (CCAMP) recommends that single storey rear extensions should not extend further back than 2 metres from the original building or further than either of the extended walls of the neighbouring houses.
8. However, in this case, the proposed extension is only marginally deeper than the extension at the attached property, No. 18 Westcott Crescent and indeed, the rear extension at the property on the other side of the footpath, No. 122. Furthermore, from the information submitted by the Appellant, there appears to be deeper extensions present within immediate vicinity. To my mind, the overall scale and design of the extension is subservient to the host dwelling and when completed with an appropriate finish, it would have a neutral effect on the overall character and appearance of the CA.
9. On this basis, I am satisfied that the single storey extension does not conflict with the overall aims of policies D3, D4, D6 and HC1 of the London Plan, policy 1.1 of the Council's adopted Development Strategy 2026, policies 7.4, 7B and 7C of the Council's adopted Development Management Development Plan Document and the CCAMP which collectively promote high quality design which responds to its context and where applicable, preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the CA.
10. The proposal also seeks to change the hipped roof of the host dwelling to a gable in order to accommodate a very large box dormer which would occupy the overwhelming majority of the existing and altered rear roof profile.
11. The change from hip to gable would radically alter the roof profile of the host dwelling and would imbalance its relationship with the attached dwelling. This would harm both the character of the two dwellings and that of Westcott Crescent, which as explained, is partly defined by the predominance of hipped roofs. In addition, the proposed box dormer would be a bulky and oversized addition which would be disproportionate and out of keeping with the modest scale and form of the host dwelling. This would conflict with the CCAMP which

explains that roof extensions should be built within the existing roof slope and changing a hipped roof to a gable should be avoided.

12. For the above reasons, I find that the proposed hip to gable roof alteration and box dormer would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. In such terms, this element of the scheme conflicts with the policies and guidance referred to above.
13. The harm to the heritage asset would be 'less than substantial' as directed by the Planning Practice Guidance, but I attach considerable importance and weight to the statutory duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 that special attention should be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
14. The National Planning Policy Framework explains that 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. It goes on to say that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this case, the Appellant has not suggested that there are any.
15. The Appellant does, however, make a general assertion that a range of roof alterations are present within the CA. None that I could see were directly comparable to the proposal before me and in any event, I have considered the appeal proposal on its individual merits.
16. I am mindful that a range of additional concerns have been raised by third parties. However, these relate, in the main, to the use of the property as a HMO, which is not a matter for me to consider.

Overall Conclusions

17. I conclude that the single storey extension, which is partially built, is acceptable. I therefore grant planning permission for this development subject to the standard condition which directs that it must take place in accordance with the approved plans. I shall also impose the additional conditions suggested by the Council requiring the external finish of the extension to match that of the host dwelling in order to ensure a visually acceptable development and preventing the roof of the extension from being used as an amenity space in order to protect the living conditions of neighbours.
18. I also conclude that the proposed hip to gable alteration and rear roof extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the CA. In such terms, this element of the scheme conflicts with the development plan policies outlined above. The arguments advanced by the Appellant do not outweigh this harm and policy conflict and therefore this element of the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR