



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2022

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/21/3281673

10 Essex Road, Acton W3 9JA

- 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 Michael Sheilds of Rijac Properties Ltd against the decision of London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 212204FUL, dated 1 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is mansard roof over the main part of the building with sloping roofs to all four sides to create an additional habitable unit.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the application form. Although different to that on the decision notice and appeal form, no confirmation has been provided to indicate that a change was agreed.

Main Issues

3. The main issues of the appeal are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area,
 - whether the development would appropriately support the circular economy, with regard to refuse facilities; and
 - whether the development would appropriately facilitate and encourage future occupiers to cycle, with regard to cycle storage.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. There is a variety of property styles and heights in the surrounding streets. This includes differing roof shapes and I saw examples of alterations and extensions at roof level. Nonetheless, the pairs of properties along Essex Road have a consistency to the roofscape. This, along with the general uniformity to the proportions, materials and features on their front elevations positively contribute to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposed mansard roof would be partly screened from street level given the angle of views and set back from the edge of the roof. It would have

sloping roofs and the window style would draw on the existing ones at the site. In addition, views from the rear would be in the context of the more varied built form at Essex Road and the surrounding streets where properties have been extended in different ways.

6. Nevertheless, there are no similar mansard roofs in the same row. The scheme would disrupt the existing steady pleasant flow of the roofscape in the street, breaking the existing roof line. Moreover, it would unbalance the strong symmetry that the pair of properties the appeal site forms part of currently have. This would be seen from across the street and in longer views along Essex Road. In addition, the spaces between the pairs of properties would expose views of much of the depth of the proposed mansard roof.
7. My attention has been drawn to examples of other roof extensions in the area. 1 Essex Road is a detached property at the end of the street and the roof works retain the symmetry of the building. The other sites would not be seen with the appeal site. The Grafton Road property was part of a street of pitched roof properties with the roof extension being to the rear. The Holmwood Mansion site again covered the block of built form and retained a symmetry to the building which already had a pitched roof in part. The Mill Hill Road alterations did not involve raising the roof height as in the appeal proposal. Therefore, these are materially different to the scheme before me.
8. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. The scheme would conflict with the design aspirations of Policies D1, D4, D6 of the London Plan, Policies 7.4 and 7A of DPD¹ and the SPD².

Circular Economy

9. The proposal before me relates to a single additional unit and controls on the existing units are outside the scope of this appeal.
10. At the time of my visit, bins were stored off the street to the front of the appeal building, a similar arrangement to several other properties in the street. There was also a shed and outdoor space at the rear of the site. I see no reason why the refuse requirements for the proposed unit could not be accommodated at the site. Were the appeal to be allowed, a condition could be imposed requiring details of the bin storage to be agreed.
11. As such, the proposal would provide appropriate refuse storage facilities. It would accord with Policies SI7 and SI8 of the London Plan where they, in part, seek to ensure adequate and easily accessible storage space for refuse is provided to encourage recycling as part of the circular economy.

Cycling

12. As above, a single additional unit is proposed and controls on the existing units are outside the scope of this appeal. There is outdoor space available at the site, an existing shed and the scheme relates to a single, small unit of accommodation. Therefore, there would not be significant space required for cycle storage. From the evidence before me, and my observations on site, I see no reason why sufficient cycle storage space could not be provided on site. The

¹ Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document

² Supplementary Planning Document – SPD 4 Residential Extensions

location and retention of this could be secured by condition were the appeal to be allowed.

13. The proposed development would be able to facilitate and encourage cycling with regard to cycle storage. It would comply with Policy T5 of the London Plan where it seeks to remove barriers to cycling.

Other Matters

14. The proposal would align with the Framework where it seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing and acknowledges that small-scale developments can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement and be built out quickly. In addition, there is policy support for the efficient use of land and the site is in a location accessible to services and facilities.
15. Notwithstanding this, being for a single additional unit, the contribution towards housing supply, along with economic and social benefits from the development work and occupation would be small.
16. A lack of harm to the living conditions of nearby occupiers, highway safety or parking provision are neutral factors and do not weigh in favour of the scheme. While the scheme would be acceptable in terms of refuse and cycle provision, the harm to the character and appearance of the area is determinative.

Conclusion

17. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
18. Therefore, for the reason given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR