



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2025

by **B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/24/3354536

30 Islip Gardens, Northolt, Ealing, UB5 5BX.

- 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 Malcombe Hervey against the decision of Ealing Council.
 - The application Ref is 243097HH.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a partial side extension with mono-pitch roof to rear and installation of two roof lights; alteration of roof from hip to gable end; rear roof dormer extension and installation of three roof lights to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a partial side extension with mono-pitch roof to rear and installation of two roof lights; alteration of roof from hip to gable end; rear roof dormer extension and installation of three roof lights to front roof slope, at 30 Islip Gardens, Northolt, Ealing, UB5 5BX, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24309HH, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out only in accordance with the following approved plans;

KY/PL/160324/01 (Location and Site Plans),
KY/PL/160324/02 (Existing Floor Plans),
KY/PL/160324/03 (Existing Elevations),
KY/PL/160324/04 (Proposed Floor Plans) and
KY/PL/160324/05 (Proposed Elevations)

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling together with its semi-detached neighbour, and on the wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The Council considers and, on appraisal of all the written representations, I agree that there is no objection to the proposed rear roof dormer extension and the creation of a vertical gable side wall in place of the hipped roof. This appropriately takes into account that the neighbouring property, No 28, has a long-established pitched roof and side gable. As a result, the modified roof form of No 30 would in itself reverse a loss of symmetry within the semi-detached pair of dwellings.
4. Objection focusses primarily on the side extension, included solely to facilitate the installation of a straight staircase, suitable to accommodate a future stair lift for the present residents. Such a preference is a material consideration, but would cater essentially for transient personal circumstances and carries little planning weight in this appeal. The side extension falls to be assessed primarily on its design merits.
5. The side extension would be a modest 1.2m wide, set away from the side boundary, and would be well set back from the main front elevation. However, the side wall, rising almost to the height of the main roof ridge, would depart from and obscure the proposed gable form.
6. The street scene is varied, with many side and roof extensions to the original dwellings, often replacing hipped gable roofs of bungalows with a pitched form, in order to accommodate first-floor accommodation.
7. In this context, I do not consider that the 1.2m plain wall of the side extension, despite its height, would appear so incongruous in any view from the street or neighbouring property to warrant substantive planning objection.
8. For these reasons, I do not consider that the proposed development would undermine the objectives of Policy 7.4 of the adopted Ealing Local Plan (ELP) concerning planning effects of development on local character, or Policies D3-4 of the adopted London Plan requiring high-quality design making the best use of land.
9. The Council considers and, on appraisal of all the written representations, I agree that there is no objection to the proposed development with respect to residential amenity at any neighbouring property, having regard to Policy 7B of the ELP. I find nothing further to affect my decision.
10. The policies quoted above are all essentially consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and are the proper basis for assessing the appeal. I conclude that the proposed development would be compliant with the development plan as a whole and should therefore be allowed, subject only to the standard conditions set out above.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR