



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2025

by **Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/25/3370957

13 Palm Grove, Ealing W5 4AF

- 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 Adam Bandurski against the decision of the London Borough of Ealing Council.
 - The application Ref is 251164HH.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a hip to gable extension, flat roof rear dormer and ridgeline increase by 300mm.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the semi-detached pair of dwellings of which the appeal dwelling forms part, and that of the local area

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling and its semi-detached pair sit at the end of the cul-de-sac at Palm grove. The approach to the semi-detached pair is lined on either side by terraced properties. All dwellings in the cul-de-sac are of the same scale and architectural expression, and there is consistency in the height of the ridgeline. This presents a cohesive streetscape to the close that also reflects the character and appearance of the wider area that forms part of a planned estate.
4. On my site visit it was apparent that earlier approvals for extension of the appeal property were in the process of being implemented. The proposal would further extend the appeal dwelling at roof level to create additional living space. This would be through the change to a hip to gable end on the flank side of the appeal dwelling and through the addition of a rear flat roofed dormer extension. This would be accompanied by an increase in ridge height of the appeal dwelling by 0.3 metres, achieved by extending the front roof slope at its existing angle. The proposed rear dormer would take up nearly all of the rear roof of the appeal dwelling, aligning with the proposed new gable end and with the existing rear wall of the appeal dwelling, with only a small strip of the existing roof retained below the chimney stack.

5. A lawful development certificate, in accordance with the provisions of the GPDO¹, has been issued by the council in relation a hip to gable extension with a rear dormer taking up the majority of a rear roof of the appeal dwelling. Although similar to that proposed, it does not include an increase in height of the ridgeline. This constitutes a legitimate fallback position for the appellant, to which I have afforded considerable weight in my considerations.
6. The proposed increase in ridge height, although achieved by extending only the front roof slope and not changing its angle, would result in a step up in ridge height between the appeal dwelling and its semi-detached pair and a misalignment between their ridge-lines. This additional height would result in the appeal dwelling appearing as evidently incongruous in relation to its semi-detached pair.
7. This would also not reflect the existing consistent ridgeline of the semi-detached pair or the other dwellings in the cul-de-sac and would be disruptive to the existing collective coherent balanced appearance and character. Whilst I noticed on my site visit that there are stepped ridgelines in the local area of the planned estate beyond Palm grove, these appear to be original and associated with a change in topography navigated by longer terraces. These steps in the ridgeline contribute to a constant building height.
8. Whilst the change from a hipped to a gable end could be achieved through the potential fallback option open to the appellant, it would disrupt the visual balance and coherence that currently exists between it and its semi-detached pair. However, as a permitted development it would be in accordance with the objectives and provisions of the GPDO. However, the proposed increase in ridge line would compound the effect of the loss of visual balance resulting from a hip to gable extension. This would be to an extent that would result in the detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the semi-detached pair and local area set out above.
9. The appellant has brought to my attention 3 planning approvals in the council area from 2016-18, which according to the appellant, include the raising of the ridgeline of the dwelling in each case by 0.3 metres. However, I have not been provided with any plans or details of the approved schemes, which would have been considered on their own individual merit. I have done likewise in my consideration of the appeal proposal, which is a main tenet of the planning system. As I am not in a position to determine whether the approvals brought to my attention provide exemplars for the appeal proposal, I have given these little weight in my considerations.
10. For the reasons above, the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the semi-detached pair of which the appeal dwelling forms part, and to that of the local area. This would conflict with Policies 7B and 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management DPD (2013) and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021). Amongst other matters, these collectively seek development that is of high design quality and sympathetic to local character.

¹ The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)

11. The Council's decision finds that the appeal development is contrary to Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021). However, as this policy relates to policy guidance and design management procedures for London planning authorities, I have not come to this same conclusion.

Conclusion

12. Whilst the proposal would increase the size of the living area of the appeal dwelling, this would be primarily a private benefit. As there are no public benefits that outweigh the harm I have identified, the appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR