



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 May 2021 by Max Webb BA (Hons)

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/21/3269279

49 Shakespeare Road, Acton W3 6SE

- 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 J Wheatley against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 204824HH, dated 23 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with dormer to rear and raising ridge by 300mm.
-

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. A lawful development certificate has been granted for a rear dormer and front rooflights similar to those proposed as part of this development. Therefore, this recommendation will focus on the effects of the proposed raising of the ridge height of the property and the alterations to the position of the ridge.
4. Since the determination of this application a new London Plan (2021) has been adopted. New policies have superseded the previous policies, and appeals must be assessed against the current development plan. Both the Council and the appellant have been given the opportunity to consider the relevant new policies for this appeal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the alterations to the ridge on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site sits within a terrace group that has a built pattern of stepping up ridge heights from east to west. The relatively consistent distance the ridgelines are set back on the roof of the terrace properties along this side of the appeal street are an important feature of the character of this area.
7. The proposal seeks to raise the ridge height of the property. The proposal would be higher than the neighbouring properties on both sides and would

therefore disrupt the stepped ridges along this street. Whilst there is a very slight degree of variation in roof height contrary to the built pattern in this terrace group, such as No.43, this is to a much lesser extent than would arise with the appeal proposal. Therefore, the proposed development would interrupt the built pattern on the terrace group to the detriment of the street scene.

8. The proposal would move the ridgeline of the property backwards. This would interrupt the consistency of ridgelines along the terrace and would also increase the scale of the front slope of the property. Thus, this would, regardless of how close the overall scale of the development would be to the parameters of permitted development, result in an inappropriate and unsympathetic alteration to the host dwelling. Raising and pushing back the parapets in line with the roof would not diminish the effects of the increased scale of the front slope, and therefore there would still be visible harm to the character and appearance of the street scene.
9. Attention has been drawn to permission granted at 44 and 46 Shakespeare Road, opposite the appeal site. These properties are semi-detached and do not form the side of the street that has a specific pattern, and therefore raising the roof height of these properties would not be detrimental to their character or that of the street scene. Permission has also been granted to raise the ridge height at 7 and 13 Shakespeare Road. The changes to both of these properties brings the ridge height in line with their neighbouring dwellings (No.9 and No.15), and therefore does not disrupt the pattern of that terrace group to the same extent as the appeal proposal would. Furthermore, neither of these sites, nor that referenced at 47 Shakespeare Road, push the ridgeline back to the same extent as the appeal proposal, which ensured those alterations remained sympathetic to the street scene in terms of scale.
10. For the above reasons, the alterations to the ridge would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013), which states that development should complement the building pattern and scale of the area. It would also be contrary to Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021), which aims to ensure development delivers quality design.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. The proposal would not accord with the Development Plan when it is considered as a whole. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Max Webb

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Taylor
INSPECTOR