

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2022

**by Andrew Dale BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 5th December 2022**

---

### **Appeal Ref. APP/A5270/D/22/3302645**

### **99A Elers Road, West Ealing, London W13 9QE**

- 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 Rajesh Kumar Sailopal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
  - The application ref. 221075HH, dated 10 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 April 2022.
  - The development proposed is *"Roof extensions including front hip to gable and rear dormer and side rooflight, alterations to existing front bays and changes in the fenestration to accommodate 3 bedrooms in the loft and internal alterations."*
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for roof extensions including front hip to gable and rear dormer and side roof light, alterations to existing front bays and changes in the fenestration to accommodate 3 bedrooms in the loft and internal alterations at 99A Elers Road, West Ealing, London W13 9QE in accordance with the terms of the application ref. 221075HH, dated 10 March 2022, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents titled and/or numbered: Location Plan; Existing and Proposed Block Plans; Existing Floor Plans (AS/ER/P01); Existing Elevations and Section (AS/ER/P02); Proposed Floor Plans (AS/ER/P03); Proposed Elevations and Section (AS/ER/P04); and Design and Access Statement January 2022.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall accord with those specified in the box titled "NOTES AND MATERIAL DESCRIPTION" on the drawing Proposed Elevations and Section (AS/ER/P04).

### **Preliminary matters**

2. I have noted the comprehensive description of the proposal in the Council's decision notice, but part of the Council's description is potentially misleading.
-

The 2 existing so-called “outrigger” extensions to the front of the property have pitched and gabled roofs rather than hipped roofs and as these 2 bays are to be squared off with raised flat roofs they would not appear as gable ends as such. The description of the proposed works given on the householder application form, as set out in the heading and decision above, is sufficiently succinct and accurate for the purposes of this appeal.

3. I have noted that the Council raised no specific objections to the rear dormer or side roof light or to the minor changes to the front curtilage shown on the submitted plans relating to bin and cycle storage, landscaping and alterations to the front boundary wall and gate. I see no reason to disagree.

### **Main issue**

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings, including its visual impact upon neighbouring properties along Elers Road.

### **Reasons**

5. Nos 99 and 99A comprise a pair of detached bungalows which stand behind high brick boundary walls towards the south-western end of Elers Road close to its junction with Northfield Avenue.
6. These bungalows have very limited architectural merit. No. 99, the wider and taller of the 2 bungalows, is covered by green interlocking tiles. No. 99A appears as if it has been squeezed onto a very small site, the visual clues being a plot which is far narrower across the front compared to no. 99 and tapers to a point at the bottom of the rear garden and the awkward shapes of the side wall and roof which are tight to the angled south-western side boundary.
7. The bungalows represent something of a transitional development in this locality. They are situated between the predominantly 2-storey houses along Elers Road to the north-east, most of which are attractive examples from the Edwardian period, and the rear of the 3-storey buildings on Northfield Avenue and at 101 Elers Road to the south-west which are separated from the appeal site by a service road leading up to a vehicle workshop at 103 Elers Road.
8. Even though no material increase in footprint or overall height is proposed, the scheme would undoubtedly change the appearance of the appeal property by the inclusion of a hip to gable roof extension to the front and taller front bay projections squared off with flat roofs and corner windows on the loft floor.
9. The resulting dwelling would not be consistent with the neighbouring bungalow at no. 99. However, these 2 dwellings already differ in form and character from, and are therefore inconsistent with, all the other nearby dwellings. Given the rather weak character of the existing property and the mix of building types, heights and sizes in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site, the degree of change brought about through this contemporary design approach would not appear obtrusive or incongruous. Rather, I consider that it would be a positive intervention. Although this type of design is not seen anywhere else in the street scene, it would be an architecturally coherent proposal which would add to the existing diversity of built forms in the local area whilst retaining the overall character of a bungalow in terms of height and general form.

10. Given the limited scale and height of the proposed changes at roof level and the context of the appeal site, it would be a stretch of the imagination to suggest, as the Council does, that the roof geometry and the 2-storey front bays would appear overbearing and out of keeping as perceived by adjacent users along Elers Road. The visual impact upon the neighbouring properties along Elers Road would not be untoward for any reason. This includes St Pauls Vicarage at 102 Elers Road, an early 20<sup>th</sup> century neo-Georgian style property, which is a locally listed building set back from the opposite side of Elers Road. The scheme would not adversely affect the setting or significance of this heritage asset.
11. I consider that the proposed development would exhibit appropriate innovation and yet be sufficiently respectful of the original building's character and appearance, the local character more generally and the setting of the site.
12. I find on the main issue that the proposed development would not have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings or upon neighbouring properties along Elers Road in terms of visual impact. As the proposed scheme would deliver good design, satisfactorily respond to the distinctive local building forms and patterns of development, respect the scale, design, appearance, massing and height of the surrounding physical context and at least maintain and complement the character and appearance of the local area, it would not conflict with the aims of Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Council's Development Management Development Plan Document 2013 or Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021. There would be respect for the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it seeks to achieve well-designed places.
13. The Council found the impact of the proposal on the residential amenities of 99 Elers Road to be within acceptable limits with particular regard to the matters of overlooking/privacy, light and outlook. I see no reason to disagree with that stance. The proposed development would not have any unacceptable impacts on the amenities of those neighbouring occupiers or any others.
14. In addition to a condition setting a time limit for the commencement of development, a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the relevant approved drawings is necessary as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition regarding the materials of construction to ensure that the development would safeguard the character and appearance of the area. In this case, it would be more accurate and appropriate to follow the detailed materials schedule provided on one of the plans, rather than simply specify the use of matching materials.
15. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised and the absence of objections from any local residents or organisations, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

*Andrew Dale*

INSPECTOR