



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2019 by S Witherley Assoc RTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/3234571 **12 Newburgh Road, London, W3 6DQ**

- 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 Wheeler against the decision of the Council of Ealing.
 - The application, Ref 191301HH, dated 19 March 2019, was refused by notice 15 May 2019.
 - The development proposed as described on the application form is: Loft conversion; raising of roof ridge, 2 dormers on South side elevation and build up hip-to-gable wall on rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The effect on 1) the character and appearance of the area 2) the living conditions of surrounding occupants.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. The property is a large detached villa in a street containing a mix of house types, sizes and styles including semi-detached and terraced properties. Despite the mix there is rhythm and uniformity in their appearance. This is depicted from the general design characteristics and form of the dwellings which incorporate hipped roofs, projecting bay windows and front gables.
 5. No. 12 has a hipped roof with a short, central ridge and projecting gable to the front. The roof would appear to be largely unaltered from its original form. The proportions of the roof and symmetry of the hipped gables are important elements in the overall composition of what is an attractive detached property, as are minor details such as the matching finials on the short central ridge. To the rear is a full width ground floor extension and above this is an off-centre first floor addition with prominent bay window. The proposal would see the roof of No. 12 increase and consequently alter the pitch to accommodate additional living accommodation. In addition, the rear hip would be removed and replaced with a gable end with Juliet balcony. Two dormer windows would be inserted to the side elevation and the pitch of the front gable would be modified to match the pitch of the main roof.
-

6. The proposed alterations would significantly alter the design, scale, form and proportions of this traditional detached dwelling. By doing so it would irrevocably change the proportions and symmetry of the roof which are key defining features of the property. Additionally, the proposed design would be inconsistent with the hipped roof profile of the majority of other properties along this section of Newburgh Road. The proposed side dormers along with modifications to the front gable would only add to this discordance and emphasise the disproportionate roof height, pitch and form. Whilst the height would increase to a level similar to that of neighbouring properties, the height and roof profile of these properties are proportionate to their original design, scale and form. In contrast, the height and profile of the proposed roof would not reflect the original form and scale of the appeal property and would appear as a bulky and top-heavy addition. Accordingly, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area. It would not, therefore, accord with the Councils Supplementary Planning Document *SPD4 Residential Extensions* (SPD).

Living Conditions

7. The proposed works would be residential in nature and confined to development within the roof space. As a result of its location, the separation distance from neighbouring occupiers and the retained outdoor space between neighbouring properties, it is considered that the surrounding living conditions would not be eroded by inappropriate overlooking, noise, light pollution or any other form of operational emissions. As such the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the living conditions of nearby occupiers and thereby complies with Policy 7A of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) (DP).

Other Matters

8. Details including photographs of other developments within the area have been submitted. However, these do not represent a direct parallel with the proposal. In any event, the proposal has been considered on its individual merits and against the specific context within which it sits.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. On balance, my findings on the lack of harm arising in respect of the living conditions of neighbouring residents do not outweigh the harm found in relation to the character and appearance of the area. As such the proposal does not accord with Policy 7B of the EDP and Policy 7.6 of the London Local Plan (2016). Whilst Policy 7D has been cited by the Council, it is not considered that this Policy is relevant given the nature of the proposal and that it would not increase the demand for open space.
10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, it is recommended that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, also agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Preston INSPECTOR