



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 July 2022 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MRTPI MIEMA CEnv

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/22/3300008

22 Westfields Road, Ealing, Acton London W3 0AX

- 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 C White against the decision of the Council of London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 220534HH, dated 9 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with new dormers and hip to gable extension.
-

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 Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property (No.22) is a semi-detached bungalow located on Westfields Road in Acton area of London. It has been extended at the rear, nevertheless, is symmetrically paired with the neighbouring property no.23. They are part of a group of semi-detached bungalows of similar scale and design, which surround a garden square area and are accessed from Westfield Road via a pedestrian path. The surrounding area is residential, and there are other similar groups of semi-detached bungalows grouped in such manner. This creates a neat and unified streetscene.
5. The proposal would wrap around the entire rear roof slopes and more than half the north elevation roof slope. This would be contrary to guidance provided in the (2004) Plan for the Environment, Ealing's unitary development plan Supplementary Planning Documents (the 'SPD'): SPD 4 Residential Extensions.

It advises that roof extensions comprising dormer windows should not wrap around two roof slopes¹.

6. The proposal would appear top heavy by virtue of its mass and despite the proposed use of matching materials, it would not appear as a subordinate addition to the existing dwelling. This would be harmful to the appearance of the host dwelling as with the proposed extensions being of the same height as the ridge of the existing house, it would create the visual effect of a partially flat-roofed two-storey dwelling and present an awkward and obtrusive resultant design. I have had regard to the appellant's contention that the proposed development would not be visible from Westfields Road as it is mostly at the rear of the property, but whilst this may well be the case, it would nevertheless be visible from a number of private vantage points, and this would not provide acceptable mitigation for the poor design quality of the resultant dwelling.
7. The proposal would also significantly imbalance the symmetrical pair with no.23 and detract from the contribution of the pair to the character of the group of bungalows and the streetscene. The sheer bulk of the proposed development would set it at odds with the prevailing character, reinforcing the impression of a two-storey development as demonstrated in the submitted plans, that would represent an incongruous addition to the area.
8. The appellant refers to other dormer extensions within the surrounding area. Although each proposal must be assessed on its own individual merits, it is clear that many of these examples are either of a smaller scale than is proposed, do not wrap around more than one roof slope or relate to two-storey properties. Due to the differing circumstances, they do not therefore set a precedent for the proposed development.
9. Taking all the above points together, I find that the design, scale and mass of the proposed loft conversion with new dormers and hip to gable extension would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, there would be conflict with the aims and objectives of Policies D4, D5 and D6 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management DPD (2013), the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) as well as the SPD. These seek amongst other things to ensure that new development respects the local character of existing built areas with regard to street sequence, building pattern, scale, materials and detailing.

Other Matters

10. I have had regard to the appellant's desire to improve the overall quality of the property and create additional space for a growing family as well as family visiting from abroad, and furthermore to provide additional space to work from home. However, whilst I recognise these to be benefits of the proposal personal to the appellant, they do not outweigh the harm that would be caused by the proposed development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, that outweigh this conflict.

¹ See Figure 6.2 in section 6.0 on page 18

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR