



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2019 by Scott Britnell MSc FdA

Decision by V Lucas LLB (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/19/3235283

4 Doris Ashby Close, Perivale, UB6 7FD

- 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 Riadh Alkhalisi against the decision of the London Borough of Ealing Council.
 - The application Ref 191583HH, dated 4 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "proposed single storey rear extension. New second floor loft extension with front and rear dormers."
-

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.

Procedural Matters

3. During the course of the application, the description of development was revised to reflect the development that required planning permission. The Council describe the development as, "single storey rear extension; alteration of roof from hip to gable end; front and rear dormer roof extensions". I note that the appellant has used the same description within their appeal submission and so I have assessed the appeal on that basis.
4. The appellant suggests that the Policies and Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) referred to by the Council predate the PPG by some considerable time and should be afforded less weight. Having reviewed these, I consider that they are broadly consistent with the PPG.
5. Within the refusal reason, the Council refer to the London Plan 2015. Whilst the policies that have been provided are in respect of the London Plan 2016. I have assessed the proposal on the policies before me and note that the appellant has referred to the London Plan 2016 also.

Main Issue

6. The main issue in this matter is the effect of the hip to gable roof alteration on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. The appeal site comprises an end of terrace dwellinghouse on the south side of Doris Ashby Close within a mixed residential development of dwelling houses and flats. The proposal includes the erection of a single storey rear extension to which the Council has raised no objection. Front and rear dormers are also proposed, although these cannot be accommodated without the hip to gable roof alteration. The Council's concern is in respect of the proposed hip to gable roof works.
8. The appeal dwelling sits at the end of a small terrace of four properties within a relatively modern estate. All principal residential buildings within the estate have hipped roof forms. While there are gable projections on a number of the buildings, these are either not part of the principle roof or are set down from the main ridge, maintaining the hipped profile. This is a strong design characteristic, which provides a high degree of uniformity and contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
9. Within this context, the proposed gable end roof would appear as an unsympathetic and incongruous alteration. It would add undue bulk to the host property and would be prominent within the streetscene. Further, the existing hipped roof provides a degree of visual relief between the appeal property and the adjacent terrace, which would be detrimentally eroded by the proposal. Consequently, due to its design, scale and prominence, the proposal would appear as an incongruous and discordant feature within the streetscene and would harm the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace in which it sits and the area.
10. The appellant states that the addition of the front dormer, which requires the hip to gable alteration to facilitate it, would improve the appearance of the terrace in which the appeal property is located. While the Council consider the proposed dormers are sympathetically designed, they are dependent upon the hip to gable alteration, which I find to be unacceptable for the reasons given above.
11. The appellant also states that the hip to gable alteration would normally benefit from Permitted Development (PD) rights, but that these were removed by condition attached to the planning permission for the estate. The Council state that this was due to the development exhibiting high quality design and that future development should ensure that a high quality visual appearance remains. The appellant suggests that the existence of PD rights for the works proposed, demonstrates national government policy, and that they should only be resisted in exceptional circumstances. However, the merits of the relevant condition are not before me in this appeal and I have assessed the proposal on that basis. Further, I do not consider that the existence of PD rights that may be employed elsewhere is compelling justification to allow unacceptable development as proposed, as each case must be considered on its own merits.
12. In light of the foregoing, I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property, the

terrace in which it is located and the wider area. There would be conflict with Policies 7B and LV7.4 of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013), 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), Section 12 of the Framework and Supplementary Planning Document 4 'Residential Extensions' (2004). These seek, among other things, to ensure that development has a positive visual impact, has high quality design and is visually attractive, complements building patterns and scale, has regard to the form, function and structure of an area or street and to the character of surrounding development and is sympathetic to local character. The SPD requires development proposals for roof alterations to consider the character and design of the host property.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Scott Britnell

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

V Lucas

INSPECTOR