
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 June 2022 by Max Webb BA(Hons)

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/22/3294027

355 Acton Lane, Acton W3 8NR

- 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 Mrs Touria Doghmi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 216819HH, dated 30 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is an L-shaped loft conversion.
-

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.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of 357 Acton Lane, with particular regard to outlook and whether there would be a sense of enclosure.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is an end terrace property in a prominent corner plot location, which allows substantial views of the rear of the dwelling. The host property has a rear outrigger that is set lower than the main dwelling, which is a conforming feature of properties on this street. A number of surrounding properties have roof extensions, some of which extend out onto the outrigger. The proposal is for the addition of an L-shaped roof extension over the main roof and projecting out over the existing rear outrigger.

Character and Appearance

5. The large rear dormer extension would project almost the full length of the existing rear outrigger which would add substantial bulk at roof level. The small, sloped roof section connecting the dormer to the roof extension over the outrigger would also add further bulk at high level. Cumulatively, the scale of

the roof extension would appear substantial and out of proportion and would thus fail to achieve subservience or complement the appearance of the host dwelling.

6. Due to the positioning of the appeal site, the proposal would be visible along Acton Lane. Although the large tree on the street next to the appeal property would somewhat reduce the visibility of the proposal, this would not prevent the proposed extension from being highly visible when moving passed the property. Consequently, the highly visible addition of an unsympathetic extension at roof level would detract from the character of the surrounding area.
7. Although full-width rear dormers are a common feature in the area, and there are examples visible from the public realm, such as on the neighbouring property at No.357, these add less overall bulk at roof level. Therefore, they do not have the same disproportionate appearance as the appeal proposal would have. There are examples on the appeal street of roof extensions that extend some of the way onto the rear outriggers, however the proposal would extend significantly further, to almost the full length of the outrigger. Furthermore, these other roof extensions are not in the same highly visible location that the proposal would be. As a result, the proposal would appear out of place and would not fit in well with the surrounding roof extensions.
8. Overall, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7B of the DPD¹, which together promote development that would complement the street sequence and scale of an area and have a positive visual impact. It would likewise not accord with Policy D3 of the London Plan (adopted 2021), which outlines how development proposals should enhance local context through their scale and respond to existing character of place.
9. The Council also refer to Policy D4 of the London Plan in their reason for refusal, however this relates primarily to the procedural aspects of planning decisions and is thus not particularly relevant to this appeal.

Living Conditions

10. Although the proposal would add substantial bulk over the rear outrigger, the existing height of the outrigger means the proposal would be set down from the rear dormer of No.357. As a result, the proposal would be unlikely to cause a sense of enclosure or harmful reduction in outlook from the windows in the dormer of the neighbouring property. The existing outrigger of the appeal site and No.357 is conjoined, which means the windows in the rear wall of the set-back part of the neighbouring dwelling are away from where the proposal would be. Therefore, the proposal would be unlikely to cause a sense of enclosure or harmful loss of outlook to these windows.
11. For the same reasons, the proposal would be unlikely to have significant negative effects on the daylight or sunlight to the windows in No.357.
12. Overall, the proposal would not cause undue harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No.357. It would therefore comply with Policy 7B of the DPD, which looks to achieve a high standard of amenity for adjacent users, including good levels of daylight and sunlight. It would also comply with Policy D3 of the

¹ Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (adopted 2013)

London Plan, which aims to ensure development proposals deliver appropriate outlook. This would not, however, mitigate the harm that would arise to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Other Matters

13. The appellant suggests the proposal would provide the family with space that would mean they would not have to leave the property. However, there is no evidence before me to suggest the scale of the proposal is necessary to provide additional living space, and this could be achieved with less harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would thus not outweigh the harm found.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to the development plan as a whole, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Max Webb

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. 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