



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2023

by J Hobbs MRTPI MCD BSc (hons)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/22/3303901

89 Wells House Road, Ealing, Park Royal NW10 6ED

- 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 Caroline Sauzier against the decision of London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 221528OPDCHH, dated 31 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion at 89 Wells House Road, Ealing, Park Royal NW10 6ED in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 221528OPDCHH, dated 31 March 2022, and the plans submitted with it, 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:
 - Block and Location Plan (drawing no. PN-001)
 - Site Plan (drawing no. PN-003)
 - Proposed Plans (drawing nos. PN-007 and PN-008)
 - Proposed Elevations (drawing no. PN-009)
 - 3) Prior to the beneficial use of the loft conversion details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the banner above I have removed the words "Retrospective Application for" from the description of development on the application form as the wording does not relate to an act of development.
3. Given the presence of scaffolding around the first floor and roof during my site visit, it was not clear whether the proposed development as shown on the application plans has been fully constructed. My assessment of the acceptability of the proposal is therefore based on the plans before the Council at the time of the planning application. I will therefore refer to the proposed development throughout my decision, although certain aspects may already be constructed.

4. During the determination of the application, the Council believed that the granting of planning permission would create a new flat. However, the Appellant has clarified that the flat has previously been granted planning permission, ref. 162700OPDFUL, and this has not been disputed by the Council. The appeal proposal therefore concerns the loft conversion only.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the appeal scheme on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal building is a large semi-detached property converted into flats, located on a corner plot. There are numerous roof extensions of differing design in the surrounding area which contribute to a varied roofscape. A number of these extensions are large and cover most of the rear roof elevation of their host properties.
7. The appeal scheme would expand across much of the rear roof elevation. The extension would be flush with the eaves on the existing flat roof, above the first floor outrigger, but would be set back from the eaves and set down from the ridge on the main section of the roof. The proposed extension would therefore appear subservient to the main section of the roof. Whilst the extension is relatively large and would appear as an additional storey above the outrigger, it would be of an appropriate scale given the size of the appeal property. When viewed alongside neighbouring roof alterations and extensions it would appear similar in design and scale, so it would therefore be in keeping with the prevailing varied roofscape.
8. I conclude that the appeal scheme would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. The appeal scheme would therefore comply with policies 7.4 and 7B of the Development Management Plan, Development Plan Document, Ealing, December 2013, which require development to complement their scale and building pattern and new development must achieve a high standard of amenity for surrounding users by ensuring high quality architecture. The appeal scheme would also comply with the Ealing Housing Design Guidance, January 2022, which supports contemporary loft conversions if they respect the existing roofline and do not change the style of the roof on semi-detached properties.
9. The appeal scheme would also comply with policies D3 and D4 of The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (the London Plan), March 2021, which indicate that proposals should respond to the existing character and require proposals to be thoroughly scrutinised by borough planning officers. The appeal scheme would also comply with Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which advises that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

10. The reason for refusal detailed on the Decision Notice, says that the appeal scheme is contrary to Policy D1 of the London Plan. Policy D1 concerns the creation of area assessments and development plan documents so it does not weigh in favour or against the appeal proposal.

Conditions

11. The Council has indicated the conditions that it considers would be appropriate. I have considered these in light of the Planning Practice Guidance.
12. A condition specifying the time limit and approved plans is necessary as this provides certainty. I have imposed a condition requiring details of the external materials to be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
13. The proposed development is a loft conversion, restricting the installation of windows in walls would be unreasonable as it would restrict development in parts of the appeal property which are unaffected by this application. The proposed loft conversion includes windows to the front and rear elevations, the inclusion of further windows in these elevations would not significantly increase the extent of overlooking. The installation of windows in the side elevation of the loft conversion would be at the second floor level and only a short distance from the blank elevation of the neighbouring property and would therefore not affect the neighbour's privacy. I have therefore not included a condition restricting the installation of windows in the walls or roof of the building.

Conclusion

14. The proposed development complies with the development plan when considered as a whole. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

J Hobbs

INSPECTOR