



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2025

by **C Livingstone MA(SocSci) (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1<sup>st</sup> October 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/25/3368101**

**12a Sherborne Gardens, West Ealing, Ealing W13 8AS**

- 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 Rowan Pearson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
- The application Ref is 250029FUL.
- The development proposed is described as 'rear roof extension over rear outrigger; raising of outrigger ridgeline; incorporation of three rooflights into flat portion of roof and two rooflights into outrigger rear facing roofslope. Add another room to the first floor flat.'

---

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The Council has referred in its decision to policies within Ealing's draft new Local Plan (ELP). I note that the draft plan is at an advanced stage and the policy referred to in the delegated report, DAA may be subject to suggested modifications by the Inspector. Further, although the ELP is at an advanced stage and is a material consideration, at the current time it does not form part of the statutory development plan. As such I give it only limited weight in my assessment of the appeal.
3. It is noted in the final paragraph of the section titled 'Impact on Street Scene, Character and Design' of the Officer's Report there is an error in the Council's reasoning. My assessment is based on the content of this section and the Council's reason for refusal, with due regard to these factors the word 'not' was included in error.

### Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
  - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area; and
  - the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties 12 and 10 Sherborne Gardens with regard to outlook.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

5. The appeal site is located within a primarily residential area. The host property is part of a group of late Victorian semi-detached, two storey dwellings which have

paired rear outriggers with pitched roofs. The outriggers also have attractive double height bays reflecting the front elevations of the dwellings. The host property, 12 A Sherborne Gardens (No 12), is an upper floor flat with accommodation in the roof. Like several buildings in the vicinity, it has a large box dormer on the rear elevation of the main roof.

6. The proposal is for the erection of a flat roofed extension that would extend from the existing box dormer on the rear of the main roof slope. The proposed extension would extend over almost the entire outrigger on the rear elevation.
7. Being smaller and lower, the rear outrigger was designed to appear subservient to the main body of the property. The erection of the flat roofed extension would impact negatively on the balance between the main body of the dwelling and the rear outrigger, resulting in the loss of the existing pitched roof form. Therefore, due to its box like appearance, the extension would not reflect the finely balanced proportions and detailing of the original property. Given the overall scale and bulk of the extension my concerns in this regard are not addressed by the fact that it would be slightly lower than the ridge height of the main dwelling. While not clearly visible from the public realm, the quality of the architecture has a positive impact on the character and appearance of the area. Due to its scale and position, the extension would be a prominent and incongruous addition when viewed from the rear gardens of neighbouring properties. Further, the proposal would result in the erosion of symmetry between No 12 and the attached property No 10 Sherborne Gardens (No 10).
8. It is acknowledged that the proposed dormer extension incorporates a palate of external materials and some design details to match the existing dwelling. However, this does not ameliorate the harm I have identified with regard to the overall design and scale of the proposal; which is not lessened by an absence of heritage assets.
9. For the reasons detailed above the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Therefore, it conflicts with Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021 (LonP) and Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document 2013 (EDPD) which require that developments deliver good design and enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their scale, appearance and shape; and also that extensions to existing buildings should ensure that the resulting development should ensure that the resulting development as a whole meets design standards.
10. As detailed above, Policy DAA of Ealing's draft new Local Plan is also a material consideration, albeit of limited weight. This policy requires that new development must be of a high quality design, for the reasons detailed above the proposed scheme would also conflict with this policy.

#### *Living conditions*

11. The high density of development in the area is reflected in minimal spacing between properties. As detailed above No 12 is divided into two flats, the host property and a ground floor flat. Neighbouring dwelling No 10 is attached to the host property and was also constructed with a rear outrigger. There are existing windows to the rear of both No 10 and the lower flat at No 12.

12. The Council's concerns are centred on the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring property No 10 and the lower ground flat at No 12 in regard to outlook. Yet, as the proposed extension would extend above an existing rear outrigger views of it would be restricted from both the lower flat at No 12 and No 10. Considering this I am not certain that it would have a harmful effect on the outlook from either of these dwellings.
13. For the reasons detailed above the development would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties 12 and 10 Sherborne Gardens with regard to outlook. Therefore, in regard to these dwellings, the development would comply with Policy 7B of the EDPD which requires that new development has a positive visual impact.
14. Again, Policy DAA of Ealing's draft new Local Plan is also a material consideration, albeit of limited weight. This policy also requires that new development must have a positive visual impact, for the reasons detailed above the proposed scheme would comply with this policy in regard to the lower flat at No 12 and No 10.

### **Other Matters**

15. In support of the appeal my attention has been drawn to similar rear extensions in the area. This includes photos of examples at 6 and 26 Sherborne Gardens and the details of the planning permission at 36 Sherborne Gardens. Based on the evidence before me extensions of the scale proposed are very much in the minority. Full details of planning permission for the extensions at 6 and 26 have not been provided, as such I cannot be certain that the circumstances were the same as the scheme before me.
16. I note that the development at 36 Sherborne Gardens shares similarities with the proposed development. However, the host dwelling, in that instance is a different design to the appeal property and the rear outrigger had a flat roof. In light of this it does not represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.

### **Conclusion**

17. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

*C Livingstone*

INSPECTOR