



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2025

by **O Tresi** MSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 JUNE 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/24/3354665

38 Lynton Road, Acton, Ealing W3 9HP

- 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 and Mrs Simon and Louise Murray against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 241573HH.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Ground Floor Side Extension behind original Garage, Ground Floor Rear raising of Terrace paving for level threshold with glazed mono-pitch roof, Roof extension to the rear with Juliet balcony'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the appeal was lodged, the National Planning Policy Framework has been revised. However, I am satisfied that there are no changes of any consequence for the main issue in this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed roof extension on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Lynton Road and surrounding roads comprise a mix of two-storey and three-storey semi-detached houses. No 38 Lynton Road is a semi-detached dwelling with a full hipped roof. The appeal proposal is to create a part hip-to-gable enlargement connected to a flat roof rear dormer spanning the width of the rear roof slope and extending in height from the eaves to the ridge. Whilst the scheme would partially retain the existing hipped roof profile at the front and the proposed glazing would create a more light-weight feature on the front elevation, the resulting roof form would be harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling, due to its bulky and top-heavy appearance and its disproportionately sized Juliet balcony. The proposal would also create an imbalance in appearance to this pair of semi-detached dwellings. The appellant contends that the design would be innovative and that it would enable the original roof form to remain legible from the street. However, the extension would appear as a discordant feature from public vantage points on Lynton Road and it would dominate the rear elevation of the building when viewed from Shalimar Road and residential properties in Essex Road.

5. The appellant has drawn my attention to a roof alteration in Goldsmith Avenue which they consider to be similar in design. However, the style of building in that case is different to the appeal property, and the street context is not comparable to Lynton Road. Consequently, the existence of this development, which is some distance from the appeal site in any event, does not persuade me that the appeal scheme is acceptable.
6. At my site visit, I observed that there are several varieties of roof alterations or extensions in the area. I have not been provided the background to these cases. However, they are generally set back from the eaves to maintain the visible form of the original roof. The appellant has pointed out that there are several flat roof buildings nearby. However, these are flatted blocks designed to different architectural concepts. Where flat roof extensions or alterations are found in the area, they are usually subservient to the original roof structure and less prominent.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, this pair of semi-detached properties and the surrounding area. As such, it would conflict with Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021), Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (Adopted 2013). Taken together, these seek that development is designed to a high standard and is in keeping with the character of the area.

Other Matters

8. I acknowledge the benefits offered by providing better quality of internal and external space together with a dual aspect loft bedroom. Nevertheless, these benefits do not outweigh the harm that I have found.

Conclusion

9. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, this appeal should be dismissed.

O Tresa

INSPECTOR