



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2017

by Stephen Roscoe BEng MSc CEng MICE

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

Decision date: 3rd August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/17/3173743

62B Goldsmith Avenue, Acton, London W3 6HN

- 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 and Mrs O'Grady against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 165841FUL, dated 30 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is the removal of a second floor roof to a rear outrigger and its replacement with a flat roof and external walls to form a new bedroom and bathroom and the removal of a rear pitched roof to the host building and its replacement with a new dormer.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The application was submitted as recorded above. The Council however, in its refusal notice, described the proposed development as a roof extension to a rear (main) roof slope and a part rear roof extension to an outrigger roof slope, (involving the conversion of roof space to habitable use). I consider that this better describes the proposal, and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for a roof extension to a rear (main) roof slope and a part rear roof extension to an outrigger roof slope, (involving conversion of roof space to habitable use) in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 165841FUL, and subject to the conditions listed at the end of this decision.

Application for Costs

3. An application for costs was made by the appellant against the Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Reasons

4. I consider the main issue in this case to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.
5. The appeal property comprises a three storey semi-detached house with the second floor situated within the roof space. The second floor includes a dormer window on the front roof slope of the house and, at the rear, the second floor lies under a combination of flat roofs and the rear roof pitch of the main house. The appeal property is situated at the southern limit of a row of similar properties. To the south of the appeal property, the rear elevations of the

houses exhibit a lesser scale than is the case with the row to the north which includes the appeal property.

6. The proposed roof extension would be situated above a two storey rear projection on the house. It would provide additional floor space at second floor level. The proposal would also include an additional rear dormer window which would be situated within the rear pitch of the roof of the main part of the house.
7. The roof extension would be very similar in scale to, and would indeed be adjacent to, a rear projection which exists on the adjoining semi-detached house. It would therefore have regard to the form of the area and the scale and mass of the surrounding buildings, as required by London Plan¹ (LP) Policy 7.4. It would also go some way towards balancing the rear elevations of these houses. This would make a positive contribution to the cityscape in accordance with LP Policy 7.6. The proposal would also protect the residential character of the wider Uxbridge Road corridor in accordance with Policy 2.10 of the Council's Development Strategy² (CS).
8. The window arrangement on the roof extension would differ from that on the adjoining semi-detached house. Houses to the north of the appeal property, which have similar rear projections, have however a variety of window arrangements and external finishes. The difference between the arrangement of windows therefore would not be out of keeping with the surrounding area, and any window hierarchy in the original houses has already been lost in any event.
9. The roof extension therefore would not be obtrusive in terms of scale or prominence and would complement the scale of the built environment in accordance with the Council's Development Management - Development Plan Document³ (DPD) Policy 7.4. Moreover, it would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and the visual amenity of the surrounding area.
10. The proposed rear dormer would be somewhat distinctive in comparison with the rear elevations of the other similar houses. The peak feature within the dormer glazing would however reflect a peaked dormer on the smaller house to the south of the appeal property. It would also provide a bookend feature at the end of the row of similar houses and therefore would not be seen as incongruous in nature. The rear dormer would therefore have a positive visual impact in accordance with DPD Policy 7B. It would also provide a balance between the regeneration of the Uxbridge Road/Crossrail corridor and the conservation of the built environment in accordance with CS Policy 2.1c.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. I further conclude that it thus would not conflict with LP Policies 7.4 and 7.6, CS Policies 2.1c and 2.10 and DPD Policies 7B and 7.4.

¹ The London Plan March 2015

² London Borough of Ealing: Development (Core) Strategy 2026: April 2012

³ London Borough of Ealing: Development Management: Development Plan Document: December 2013

Conditions

12. I consider that a condition relating to obscured glazing would be necessary to protect the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. It would also be necessary that the development should be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning. A condition would therefore be required to define the approved plans.

Conclusion

13. Having taken into account all other matters raised, none carry sufficient weight to alter the decision, and my conclusion is based on the evidence before me in terms of the development plan as a whole. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Stephen Roscoe

INSPECTOR

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 approved plans listed below.
 - Existing Plans and Elevations Drg. No. 648-01A
 - Proposed Plans and Elevations Drg. No. 648-02C-3
 - Site Location Plan Drg. No. 648-03A
 - Existing and Proposed Block and Roof Plans Drg. No. 648-04B
- 3) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the south facing windows of Bedroom 3 and the adjacent shower room have been fitted with obscured glazing. Details of the type of obscured glazing, together with its opening arrangements, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority before the windows are installed and, once installed, the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.
