
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2022

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/22/3292766

36 Dorset Avenue, Southall UB2 4HG

- 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 Surjeet Gandhi the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 216534HH, dated 11 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is a 'first floor rear extension, alterations to roof and new dormer window to incorporate new loft space room'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extensions and alterations on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a traditional detached dwelling located within a road which is home to properties of varying styles and sizes.
4. The appeal dwelling has already been the subject of extensions, including a two storey extension which wraps around the side and rear. The proposal seeks to introduce a first floor extension which would infill a corner of the rear of the property and also increase the size of part of the roof.
5. The proposal would raise the ridge of the main section of the two storey side extension in line with the ridge of the original part of the dwelling in order to accommodate rooms within the roof. The existing side extension is set well back from the main front elevation of the host dwelling, the roof profile would remain the same and the resulting 'crown' element would not be readily visible within the street. Given the wide variety of hipped and gabled roofs within Dorset Avenue, which sit at a range of heights, I am satisfied that this element of the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or that of the street scene.
6. I do, however, share the Council's concerns about the alterations proposed at the rear of the property. The hipped roof of the existing rear extension would be changed to a flat faced dormer with a predominantly crown roof and angled sides. This would connect into the first floor infill extension. The extension and

roof alterations would dramatically increase the scale and massing of the existing additions. Although finished in appropriate external materials, the resulting structure would be cumbersome and unsympathetic, paying little regard to the existing roof profile and traditional hipped roof arrangement. The result would not be subservient to the host dwelling, as recommended by the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 4 titled '*Residential Extensions*' and its character and appearance would be harmed.

7. Whilst this visual harm would not be seen from the public domain, the unsympathetic additions would be readily visible from the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties. As such, I consider that the development would also harm the character and appearance of its immediate surroundings, which is home to well-proportioned dwellings in the main.
8. The Appellant argues that the proposal would not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings in any way and points to the fact that no third parties objected to the scheme. However, this is a neutral factor in the overall planning balance. The Appellant also asserts that the proposal would amount to the efficient use of space and would provide much needed additional family accommodation. This is not disputed but nothing I have seen or read persuades me that it would not be possible to provide additional accommodation in a more visually acceptable manner.
9. It has also been advanced that the proposal amounts to sustainable development. The National Planning Policy Framework explains that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. As I have explained why the proposal does not exhibit good design, it cannot amount to sustainable development in the widest sense of the definition provided by the Framework.
10. Finally, I have been referred to a number of extensions within the local area. However, none of the examples highlighted include such a sizeable rear roof addition. In any event, I have considered the appeal proposal on its individual merits, taking into account the specific context within which it would sit.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. In such terms, it conflicts with policy D3 of the London Plan and policy 7.4 of the adopted Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document, which promote high quality design that respects and strengthens local context.
12. The arguments advanced by the Appellant do not outweigh this harm and policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR