



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2025

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/25/3367608

40 Milton Road, Acton, W3 6QA

- 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 Richard Foster against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 250705HH.
 - The development proposed is alteration of roof profile to form mansard roof; installation of two dormer windows to west elevation roofslope, Juliet balcony to south elevation roofslope, and three rooflights on flat roof and to north elevation roofslope; single storey front/side extension; front/side boundary treatment; and associated internal and external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. There are a number of elements to the appeal application, but there is no objection in the refusal reason to any element other than the proposed mansard roof form, with the rooflights being judged to be acceptable save for the fact that they are situated in the mansard roof form. Therefore the main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed mansard roof on the character and appearance of the house and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is an end-of-terrace, two bedroom dwelling at the corner of Milton Road and Shakespeare Road. It has a narrow frontage to Shakespeare Road, with the main elevation, including entrance door, fronting onto Milton Road, in what would otherwise be an outrigger in the other houses of the terrace. It forms a bookend to the terrace, which retains much of the charm of the mid to late 19th century period.
4. No.40 is unusual in the way it turns the corner, with the pitched roofs on the main terrace being modified into a symmetrical hipped roof that runs along the elevation to Milton Road. The house has been altered a good deal, including what appears to be an extension to the south, which has resulted in a lack of symmetry in the upper windows on the southern part of the elevation. It remains a successful response to a corner site that maintains the plan form of the terrace, and the original Victorian character of the building and the surrounding area.

5. The appearance of the appeal dwelling suggests a substantial house, but apparently it is small, with only 2 bedrooms and 1 bathroom. I can appreciate the desire to enlarge the living accommodation, to create a reasonable family home. That would clearly be a private benefit to the appellant, but the proposal must be judged against any harm to the public realm. However, I recognise that there may be a small public benefit in addressing a shortage of family homes in the area as suggested by the appellant.
6. The relevant planning policies, as set out in the officer's report, are Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document, which seek to ensure that residential development is respectful of the surrounding built form and should complement the streetscene, the building pattern, scale, materials, detailing and appearance.
7. For the appellant, it is considered that the council's decision in this case is inconsistent with other decisions made in the area. The side extension at the Shakespeare Road/Cowper Road corner is cited¹, as is a modern insertion in Spencer Road. Whilst the former was in 2007, the latter was in 2025. There is also reference to the 2 houses on each side of the Spencer Road junction with Shakespeare Road, which have mansard roofs. I have no knowledge of what led to the 2 recent developments, but neither provide a favourable precedent for the appeal proposal. The historic example at the Spencer Road junction needs some explaining to understand, but again is not supportive of the appeal scheme.
8. As I have already noted, the design of the existing house successfully turns the corner at the end of the terrace, amounting to a unique solution while maintaining the plan form of the dwellings in the terrace. In particular, the hipped roof makes this possible. The proposed mansard form at the southern end of the building is destructive of the existing composition, and would amount to an incongruous and discordant form, causing harm to the character and appearance of the house and surrounding area and the visual cohesion of the streetscene.
9. For these reasons, the appeal will be dismissed.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR

¹ The DAS references Spencer Road, but I think that the correct reference is Cowper Road, as given in the appeal statement.