



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 January 2025

by A Hunter LLB (Hons) PG Dip MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/24/3347075

83 Farndale Crescent, Greenford, Ealing UB6 9LW

- 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 Christopher Towns against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 240297HH.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable end and 2 side dormer roof extensions to form a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a hip to gable end and 2 side dormer roof extensions to form a loft conversion at 83 Farndale Crescent, Greenford, Ealing UB6 9LW, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 240297HH, 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: drawing no's 02 - existing/proposed elevations; 03 - existing/proposed elevations; 04 Rev A - proposed ground floor plan; 04 - proposed roof; 06 – proposed block plan; and 06 - Rev. A proposed section.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development has been taken from the application form as it accurately describes the proposal. The Council's description of development on its notice of decision referred to roof lights being proposed, this was not specified on the application form, and there are no new rooflight shown on the proposed plans, accordingly the appeal has been determined on this basis.
3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised on 12 December 2024. As the changes do not materially affect the main issues in this case, the parties have not been invited to comment further and there would be no unfairness as a result. Where references are made to paragraph numbers of the Framework, these are references to the most recent version.
4. The Council has referred to a policy within its emerging plan on its notice of decision. The information before me indicates that Ealing's Draft Local Plan (EDLP) is at Regulation 19 stage. Given that the EDLP is not the adopted development

plan, and it is at an early stage, which is understood not to have been examined, and in view of the requirements of paragraph 49 of the Framework, I attach limited weight to any relevant policies of the EDLP at this stage.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the:
 - character and appearance of the host property and the area with particular regard to its scale and design; and
 - the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with particular regard to the outlook for the occupiers of no. 81 Farndale Crescent.

Reasons

Character and appearance

6. The appeal site is a detached bungalow near to the entrance to Farndale Crescent, that has been altered, including a front porch and a large single storey side extension with a part flat roof. There are similar detached bungalows on both sides of the road immediately nearby, many with small spaces between them. The properties on Farndale Crescent have a variety of roof forms, both hips, and gables, and include a pair of semi-detached properties with one property having a gable and the other having a hip, the nearby properties are also a mixture of single and two storeys.
7. Ealing's SPD4 Residential Extensions, Supplementary Planning Document, undated (SPD4) says roof extensions can significantly affect the character of an area and should be designed not to be obtrusive or dominant. SPD4 also says dormer extensions should be positioned to be a minimum of 0.5 metres from the roof's ridge and eaves heights, and the sides of the roof.
8. The part of the property to be changed from hip to gable and to have flat roof dormer extensions added to both sides of its roof, is located at the rear of the property, on a roof that is also much lower than the main roof. The proposals are relatively minor additions in comparison to the size and scale of the existing property, and they would not unacceptably increase its scale and mass. Although there are no similar side dormer extensions nearby, in the context of the varying roof styles, and other visible rear dormer extensions, and the extensions already made to the host property, the proposed design and scale of the proposal in its discrete rear location would relate sympathetically to the host property.
9. As a result of its location, and the close arrangement of properties nearby, the proposed changes would not be very prominent from Farndale Crescent. However, there would be some views of the proposed roof changes when travelling in both directions along the footpath behind the appeal property, but the tall fence on the boundary between the footpath and the appeal site would restrict some views of the proposal. Furthermore, such views of the proposal would mostly be seen in the context of the existing roofs of the appeal property itself and those of no.81. Consequently, its appearance would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
10. Although the proposed dormer extensions would not meet the 0.5 metre separation from the ridge, eaves and the outer side of the roof, as set out above, the proposal

would meet the main objective of SPD4 of ensuring new development is not harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

11. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area, and comply with the relevant parts of Policy D3 of The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, dated March 2021 (LP) and Policies 7.4 and 7B of Ealing's Development Management, Development Plan Document, adopted December 2013 (EDMDPD) that amongst other things require development to be high quality and complement the scale of existing built areas and enhance local context by delivering buildings that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their scale and appearance. In addition, the proposal would also be consistent with EDLP Policy DAA, insofar as it requires development to achieve a high-quality environment and have a positive visual impact.
12. The Council referred to the proposal conflicting with LP Policy D4. Policy D4 is mainly focussed on strategic design review and analysis, and I did not find it to be directly determinative on this main issue. In addition, the Council referred to conflict with Ealing's House Design Guidance, however, there was insufficient information provided for me to conclude whether the proposal had any conflict with this Guidance.

Living conditions – existing occupiers

13. The occupiers of no. 81, as the only directly adjoining property, would likely be affected the most by the proposed development. I saw on my site inspection that the appeal site is located on a much lower ground level than no. 81 and there was a small space between the appeal property and the tall boundary fence between them and no. 81, which is at least 2 metres high. On the opposite side of the fence the space between the side of no. 81 and the boundary fence is greater, and there are some sheds occupying part of that space, one of the sheds extends beyond the rear side of the appeal property parallel with a single storey extension on the rear side of no. 81.
14. The proposed change from hip to gable would increase the size and mass of the existing roof, and the proposed dormer extension on the side of the appeal property nearest to no. 81 would also add to the bulk of the roof. However, the proposed change is relatively minor in comparison to the existing property, wholly within its existing footprint, and the gabled roof is designed with its higher parts near the middle of the roof, and away from the boundary with no. 81.
15. The proposed dormer itself would be no higher than the ridge height of the existing roof, and from most viewpoints at no. 81, due to the arrangement of the properties it would be seen as part of the roof plane of no. 83. In view of the separation between the respective properties, ground level changes, intervening structures and the modest increase in the scale and bulk of the proposal, it would not be enclosing or overbearing, nor would it harm the outlook for the occupiers of no. 81.
16. Whilst occupiers of no. 81 will be able to see the proposed extension from within their garden, this would be in the context of the existing roof of the host property and its presence would not be harmful to their living conditions.
17. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a satisfactory effect upon the living conditions of the occupiers of no. 81 Farndale Crescent, and

the proposal would comply with the relevant parts of EDMDPD Policy 7B insofar as it requires a high standard of amenity for adjacent users. In addition, the proposal would also be consistent with EDLP Policy DAA that amongst other things requires a high-quality environment in terms of its effect upon its neighbours and that sensitive users outside of the site are protected.

Other Matters

18. The Council in its report raised concern at the ceiling height of the proposed bedroom created within the roof space saying it did not provide a high-quality environment for future occupiers. However, this was not stated as a reason for refusal on its notice of decision. Whilst some parts of the proposed bedroom would have a lower ceiling height than other parts, overall, the space would be usable and would provide an enhanced living environment for the occupiers of the appeal property. As such, the concern raised by the Council has not led me to conclude differently regarding the appeal proposal.

Conditions

19. A standard implementation condition (1) has been imposed, along with a condition (2) listing the approved plans to provide certainty over what has been approved. In addition, a condition (3) is also necessary to ensure the external materials harmonise with the character and appearance of the property.

Conclusion

20. The proposed development accords with the development plan when taken as a whole and there are no other material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Hunter

INSPECTOR