



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 April 2024

by N Robinson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/23/3325243

Second Floor Flat (Flat B) 29 Cumberland Park, Acton, Ealing W3 6SX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Nigel Williams against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 221193FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as "hip to gable gable end and rear dormer roof extension involving raising of ridge height."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 19 December 2023, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been significantly amended. As a result, I consider that there is no requirement for me to seek further submissions and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by my taking this approach.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is one of a pair of hip-roofed semi-detached houses which mirrors that of the adjoining dwelling in terms of articulation and roof form. The appeal site is located in a residential area comprising 2 and 3 storey brick dwellings of varying architectural styles, some of which have undergone extensions and alterations.
5. Whilst the proposed materials would match the original roof slates, the proposal would raise the ridge height and change the roof shape of the property, noticeably increasing the scale and bulk of the roof. This would fundamentally change the appearance of the host dwelling and would result in an asymmetrical and unbalanced appearance to the semi-detached pair of properties at Nos 29 and 31 which otherwise are uniform. The roof alterations would fail to be masked by the existing chimney stack and would be prominent in views from the surrounding area, in particular in street scene views from the south. The resultant incongruent and dominating roof-form would cause harm to both the architectural integrity of the host property and the semi-detached

pair and would be an obtrusive addition to the street scene, thereby compromising the established character of the area.

6. In reaching my decision, I have noted the existence of nearby pairs of semi-detached properties with differing roof forms and ridge heights at 33, 35, 37 and 39 Cumberland Park and a property with a gable extension at 15 Cumberland Park. In my opinion, these extensions and properties are visually at odds with the predominant character of the street scene. Rather than set a precedent for allowing the appeal scheme, they highlight the need to assess each proposal on its individual merits. Furthermore, the frequency of these differing roof forms has not changed the character of the road. Consequently, these properties should not act as a precedent for this appeal.
7. I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. Conflict therefore arises with those aims of Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies 7B and 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) which collectively seek to ensure that new development is informed by and complements its surroundings. I also find conflict with Supplementary Planning Document 4 Residential Extensions (2004) which has similar aims and resists changes from a hipped roof into a gable-end roof.

Other Matters

8. I note that the appeal property is not a listed building and that the site is not located within a conservation area. Nonetheless, for the reasons set out above, I have identified that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area.
9. No objections have been received from neighbouring residents in relation to the proposal. However, this does not alter my assessment on the acceptability of the appeal scheme.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all the other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Robinson

INSPECTOR