



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2022

by A Hunter LLB (Hons) PG Dip MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/22/3307885

24 Fermoy Road, Ealing, Greenford UB6 9HX

- 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 J Kooner against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 223055HH, dated 12 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is a hip-to-gable loft conversion with rear dormer and front roof slope skylights and new window to side elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a hip-to-gable loft conversion with rear dormer and front roof slope skylights and new window to side elevation at 24 Fermoy Road, Ealing, Greenford UB6 9HX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 223055HH, dated 12 July 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 submitted plans: drawing no. A-01 rev. E – existing and proposed ground and first floor plans; drawing no. A-02-rev. E – existing and proposed loft and roof floors; drawing no. A-03 rev. E – existing and proposed front and rear elevations; drawing no. A-04 rev. E – existing and proposed NW and SE side elevations; drawing no. A-05 rev. E – existing and proposed sections AA and BB; and drawing no. A-06 rev. E – existing and proposed section CC.

(3) The dormer extension shall have a GRP roof and all other materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed roof alterations upon the character and appearance of the area, the host property and the terrace, with particular regard to the scale and design of the rear dormer window.

Reasons

3. No. 24 Fermoy Road is a hipped roof end of terraced two storey dwelling finished in render under a pantiled roof, in an established residential area that contains similar mainly two-storey properties. These surrounding properties have a variety of both hipped and gabled roofs, including many with various

alterations to the front and rear of their roofs, some of these alterations are visible from the surrounding roads. There is a path between the side of No. 24 and No. 26 Fermoy Road that leads to a large, grassed park behind the appeal site, making its front, side and rear elevations visible from public areas.

4. The proposed change from a hip to a gable roof design is repeated on the opposite end of this terrace as well as on other dwellings in the area. In view of this, together with there being other gabled properties in the area, this alteration and the obscure glazed window in the new gable end would not be harmful to the appearance of the property or the area. In addition, the design, size and position of the proposed roof lights on the front elevation are considered to be similar to other rooflights on nearby roofs. Consequently, these aspects of the proposal would be consistent with character and appearance of the appeal property and the area. It is noteworthy the Council also found similarly in respect of these elements of the proposal.
5. The proposed dormer extension would extend across the majority of the rear roof, would be set in from both the new gable end and from the property's eaves level, and would also be marginally lower than the main ridge height.
6. These discernible breaks to the side and at eaves level would ensure the proposal would be read as a roof extension and subordinate to the host dwelling. The height of the new dormer relative to the ridge would be consistent with other dormer extensions in the immediate area and would ensure a satisfactory relationship with the host property. It would not appear as an incongruous addition when viewed from the nearby park, from where other nearby dormer extensions are also viewed.
7. The view of the side of the dormer extension from Fermoy Road between No. 24 and No.26 would also not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area given its break from the end gable, the narrow space between No.'s 24 and 26, and the presence of other similar dormer windows. As a result, the design and scale of the proposed dormer extension would not be out of character with the property, the terrace or the area.
8. I therefore find the proposed roof alterations would relate sympathetically to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace, and the area. In doing so I also find the proposals to comply with the requirements of Policy 7.4 and 7B of Ealing's Development Management Development Plan Document, adopted December 2013, which amongst other things requires the design and scale of extensions and alterations to complement the local character of the area. In addition, I also find the proposal to be consistent with Section 12 the National Planning Policy Framework.
9. The Council has referred to the proposals being contrary to Policies D4 and D5 of The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, adopted March 2021. Policy D4 is mainly concerned with strategic design and review, and Policy D5 relates to inclusive design. I did not find these policies to be relevant to the determination of this appeal relating to roof alterations.

Conditions

10. A standard implementation condition is imposed, along with a condition listing the approved plans to provide certainty. A materials condition is also necessary to protect the appearance of the area and ensure conformity to those materials

specified on the Application Form. The approved side elevation clearly shows the extent of the projection of the rooflights beyond the roof plane, as such the condition recommended by the Council specifying a maximum projection is not necessary or reasonable in this case.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, considering the development plan as a whole and all relevant material considerations, the appeal is allowed.

A Hunter

INSPECTOR