



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2020

**by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 02 November 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/20/3246062**  
**140 Hicks Avenue, Greenford UB6 8HB**

- 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 Carew against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
  - The application Ref 194645HH, dated 29 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 December 2019.
  - The development proposed is described as a hip to gable roof extension, raising of the ridge height, rear dormer window and front rooflights to facilitate a loft conversion.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling. The property is located within a mainly residential area with linked and semi-detached dwellings set back from the road to the rear of front gardens which are landscaped and used for parking.
4. The proposed alterations are substantial and, in particular, the change from a hip to gable roof would be significantly at odds with the character of the existing property, including the attached building which maintains a hipped roof. Furthermore, the hip to gable end alteration would disrupt the regular rhythm of blocks and spaces and reduce the gap to the adjacent building. I noted at the site visit that the raised ridge height and gable end would be a prominent and incongruous feature in the street scene.
5. Along Hicks Avenue and elsewhere in the local area I noted a small number of other properties, including dwellings referred to by the appellant, that had carried out roof alterations of a similar nature to the appeal proposal. These dwellings are not a predominant characteristic of the area and the Council states that they do not benefit from the appropriate planning permission. In any event, these examples do not convince me as to the acceptability of the proposals.

6. The appellant refers to a lawful development certificate<sup>1</sup> (LDC) and describes the appeal scheme as being a "virtually identical scheme but the with the very marginal raising of the ridge height by no more than 200mm."
7. While the permitted development rights enjoyed by the property, as confirmed by the LDC, may create a genuine fallback position, in omitting the raising of the ridge hight, the fallback scheme would be less harmful than the appeal scheme before me. Therefore, I do not find that this is justification to allow a proposal which would cause significant harm on the character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property.
8. I therefore find that the appeal scheme would harm the character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property contrary to Policy 1.1 of the Ealing A Development Strategy (2012), Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) and Policies 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) in so far as they seek to protect the character and appearance of the area.
9. **Conclusion**
10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Mark Brooker*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> 193786CP granted October 2019