



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 May 2022

by R J Redford MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 JUNE 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/21/3286761

38 Betham Road, Greenford UB6 8RZ

- 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 N Jan against the decision of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 203905HH, dated 30 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension and enlargement of existing dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. It is noted that the appellant's Statement of Case refers to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) 2019. The Framework was revised in 2021. However, the sections pertinent to this appeal have not materially altered and I will therefore reference the revised version in my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Betham Road forms part of a residential suburb where properties are predominantly two-storey, semi-detached and near to their neighbours. Most properties originally had front gardens, but many have been converted into off road parking. To the rear, gardens are modest in size with those on the east and south side of Betham Road, including the appeal property, enjoying views over the parkland and River Brent beyond. There are many examples of rear dormers and rear and side extensions along the length of Betham Road and within the surrounding area.
5. The appeal property is located on the outward corner of Betham Road so is on an angled plot with a marginally larger garden than the surrounding properties. Its frontage has not been overly altered excepting off road parking provision, but it has been extended at ground floor level, to the side and rear following the angled western boundary.
6. The proposal would create a larger dormer than that existing. It would extend nearly the full width of the appeal property as well as nearly the full height of the roof. This is a form of dormer which is apparent throughout the local area and would not be visible from the street. It would be visible from the parkland

behind the property but would be seen as part of the existing mix of rear dormers and extensions so would not be intrusive within those wider views. However, it would require the existing hip of the roof to be altered and it is proposed that the pitch of the hip is greatly increased. In the main hip roof alterations in the area either closely match the existing pitch or have been converted into a gable. These treatments either retain the broad symmetry of the roof form of the semi-detached pair and the space between the adjacent property or create an acknowledged and defined difference using a traditional roof form. The proposal does not fall within either of these categories and would create an awkward roof form at odds with the attached property, the adjacent property and the wider streetscene when viewed from the front. Although it is noted that it would not be overly visible from the rear.

7. As the proposed dormer could not be installed without the proposed alterations to the hip of the roof, I therefore find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This would not comply with Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021), Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Adopted Development Management Plan (2013) and Policy 1.1 of the Adopted Ealing Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2012), insofar as they relate to good design and the positive relationship between new development and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Other Matters

8. The increased functionality of the existing roof space for the occupants of the property does not mitigate the harm found. Nor does the lack of harm to the living conditions of the occupants of the dwellings on either side of the appeal property. Whether the proposal would be considered permitted development or not would need to be considered via a lawful development certificate. It is noted that one with a similar description to the subject of this appeal has previously been refused by the Council (reference 203052CPL).

Conclusion

9. The appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan for the reasons given above. There are no sufficiently weighted material considerations, including the approach in the Framework, that would indicate a decision otherwise. The appeal should, therefore, be dismissed.

RJ Redford

INSPECTOR