
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 May 2023

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/23/3317480

27 Wood End Gardens, Northolt, Ealing, UB5 4QJ

- 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 Saulius Kaltanas against the decision of Ealing Council.
 - The application Ref 224626HH, dated 31 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is one bedroom one bathroom loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 27 Wood End Gardens is one of a pair of two storey semi detached house in an established residential area. They have hipped roofs and two storey squared front bays and are typical in form of most of the development along the street with the exception of a small number of detached houses and the two storey terraced buildings opposite which contain a number of ground floor shops.
4. The relevant policies in this case include D3, D4 and D5 of the London Plan which are strategic policies and relate to all aspects of design. Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document 2013 (the DPD) relate to more detailed aspects of design, requiring new development to complement the scale and building pattern and have a positive visual impact, among other things.
5. There is a high degree of uniformity in the semi detached houses along most of Wood End Gardens, particularly at roof level. There have been changes in tiling and some of the half round tiles marking the division between adjoining halves of the pair have been lost. However, the roof forms, together with their prominent chimneys remain largely unaltered apart from a small number of instances where the hipped roofs have been converted to gables, for example at Nos. 58-60.
6. I consider that the proposed increase in height of the roof, the change in angle and the extensive flank wall associated with the large full width rear flat roof

dormer would be out of keeping with the pattern of development in the area. It would introduce a bulky element which would unbalance the existing symmetry of the pair and dominate the building as a whole. Its location on a slight bend and its juxtaposition with the neighbouring houses to the west mean that it would be readily visible from the street as an anomaly in the roof plane and a discordant form of development.

7. I understand that the houses in Wood End Gardens where the roofs have been converted from hipped to gables were permitted development and that the height of the roofs was not increased. There are instances of alterations similar to the appeal proposal made to houses which are similar in style and form to the appeal property in nearby Halsbury Road East. I consider that their mass and form appear dominant and out of keeping with the original roof profile of those properties and their immediate neighbours, although they do not appear to have involved an increase in the height of the roof.
8. The appeal proposal would result in a form of development similar to those and since it would also involve an increase in height it would appear as a bulky and incongruous feature out of keeping with the overall character of the area.
9. I have taken account of the development at Nos. 121-123 Wood End Lane beyond the far end of Wood End Gardens to the southwest which relates to a building which appears originally to have been of a different style and in mixed use, rather than the prevailing, simpler form of the houses in Wood End Gardens near the appeal property. I note that the Inspector in that case found that there was some variety in the houses nearby and that the front dormers and increased roof height would not be out of character there. The original building and its alterations and extensions are different in several respects from this case and in my view that development is of limited relevance here. The appeal property stands within an extensive group of houses of a fairly uniform, simple form where I consider that the proposal would be noticeably out of place.
10. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the existing pair of semi detached houses and the wider street scene, contrary to policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan and 7.4 and 7B of the DPD.
11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR