



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 March 2015

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 12 March 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/14/2220685

4 Denison Road, London W5 1NU

- 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 Ms Catrina Morgan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref PP/2014/0934, dated 24 February 2014, was refused by notice dated 22 April 2014.
 - The development proposed is the installation of 9 (No) replacement timber windows and 1 (No) pair doors.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of 9 (No) replacement timber windows and 1 (No) pair doors at 4 Denison Road, London W5 1NU in accordance with the terms of the application Ref PP/2014/0934, dated 24 February 2014, 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: Drawing numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, No.5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12, and the Block Plan and Site Location Plan, both of which define the site.
 - 3) No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority elevations of the replacement doors in the rear elevation of the building. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural matter

2. On 10 March 2015, Further Alterations to The London Plan (FALP) were adopted and so now form part of the development plan. Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the FALP, which deal with local character, architecture and heritage assets, remain similar to their counterparts in The London Plan (2011) insofar as they are relevant to the proposal. My assessment of the appeal scheme reflects the updated planning policy position.

Main issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a mid terrace dwelling that lies within the Brentham Garden Estate Conservation Area (CA). The CA is predominantly residential in character. It derives its significance, in part, from areas of green space and cottage-style buildings in the Arts and Crafts tradition, many of which have rich detailing and timber framed casement windows. Because there are distinct patterns in the way buildings address the road and several highways in the CA gently curve, there are many attractive vistas within the designated area. Like most properties in the CA, No 4 is identified as positive building on the Council's Townscape Appraisal Map.
5. Among the threats to the CA identified in the CA Management Plan are poorly detailed new timber windows that do not exactly match the originals. Accordingly, the CA Management Plan states that the retention of existing historic windows and doors will be encouraged and that applications for their replacement using non-traditional details or materials will be generally refused.
6. The proposal is to replace 9 timber casement windows in the front and rear elevations, and the ground floor rear doors, with double-glazed timber framed units. Like their existing counterparts, the frames would be painted white. From what I saw, some of the existing front and rear window frames are in a poor state of repair with evidence of wet rot and partial renovation. To my mind, the condition of these windows detracts from the appearance of the dwelling and materially harms the character and appearance of the CA.
7. Compared to the windows to be replaced, the new windows would be very similar in design and appearance. The size, layout and proportions of the lights within each window and their method of opening would largely replicate the existing windows, with slightly deeper glazing bars and slim double-glazed units. While the new frames would therefore each have a slightly less slender profile than their existing counterparts, and include glass that would reflect light differently, resulting in a marginally heavier appearance, I consider that the difference would not be discernable even when seen at an oblique angle from the road. To my mind, there would be no appreciable gain in the prominence of the windows, at the front or rear, as a result of the proposal.
8. The appeal scheme would introduce a consistent design in the detailed fenestration of the building bringing with it a pleasing uniformity in appearance that would noticeably contrast with the less appealing mix of original and replacement windows that are currently in place, which vary in their format. In particular, a greater balance across the first floor rear windows would be achieved with the new window denoted W8 including a top hung opening light divided into four equal panes and a transom to match those windows at the same level (denoted W6 and W7). At the rear, either of the two options for the ground floor window (denoted W5) and the top floor window (denoted W9) would be acceptable.

9. The replacement door shown on drawing number 10 would be compatible with the visual character of the host building and its context in size, style and opening method. Details of the elevations would also be required if planning permission were to be granted, which could be secured by condition.
10. Overall, I consider that the intrinsic character of the host building would be maintained. In comparison to the building's existing windows, the appeal scheme would improve the appearance of the dwelling and enhance its contribution to the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset.
11. Therefore, I conclude on the main issue that the proposed development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. The character and appearance of the CA would be preserved.
12. Accordingly, there is no material conflict with the underlying aims of Policies 7.4, 7B and 7C of the Council's Development Management Development Plan Document, Policy 1.1 of the Ealing Core Strategy and FALP Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8. These policies broadly aim to ensure that development complements the building and its context, has a positive visual impact and safeguards the significance of heritage assets such as conservation areas. For the same reasons, in this case, the proposal would not undermine the principles that support the CA Management Plan.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed with conditions.

Conditions

14. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
15. The Council's suggested condition that joinery and sections of the new windows be provided is unnecessary as horizontal and vertical cross sections are shown on the submitted drawings. It is, however, necessary to require elevation details of the replacement rear doors to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the finished scheme.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR