



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 November 2025

by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/25/3373856

12a Evelyn Road, Ealing, Chiswick W4 5JL

- 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 Ms. Susan Hartman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 250794FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as a loft conversion to include a rear mansard dormer and three front facing roof lights. New external stair case to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Whilst I note that the appellant does not wish to pursue the external staircase, it remains part of the original proposal which was refused. As such, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the development proposed.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the:
 - Character and appearance of the area; and
 - Living conditions of the occupiers of 10 Evelyn Road and 12 Evelyn Road with particular regard to privacy.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property forms the upper-floors of a two-storey building adjacent to the highway. The properties surrounding the appeal site primarily form well-proportioned two-storey buildings with pitched roofs. The roof slopes of a number of these properties remain unaltered, preserving their pitched roof well-proportioned from and positively contributing to the character and appearance of the area. The roof of the appeal property appears absent of any alterations, contributing to the above identified character of the area.
5. The proposal would occupy the majority of the rear roof slope, set back minimally from the eaves and below the ridge line, appearing to occupy almost the entire rear roof slope. The pitch of the mansard roof would be relatively steep, further enhancing its significant scale and visual bulk. The proposed dormer would therefore dominate and unbalance the existing well-proportioned nature and roof

form of the appeal property, disrupting the existing roof scape and established character the area. The use of slate tiles and London stock brick to match that of the host property would do little to overcome this. The position of the appeal property close to the highway and notable separation between the side elevation and 47 Priory Road would make the proposal notable within the street scene and from the rear windows and garden areas of surrounding dwellings. The proposal's visual prominence would further exacerbate its harm to the character and appearance of the area.

6. Whilst some of these roof slopes have undergone alterations to their rear, these predominantly remain subservient and proportionate, preserving the character of the host dwelling. There are examples of larger rear dormers and mansard roof alterations which unbalance and dominate the host property. The appellant raised the substantial box dormer at No 10 and other large mansard roofs within the area. However, these are in the minority and there is little evidence before me that they benefit from planning permission. Even if they do benefit from planning permission, I cannot be sure the considerations were the same as the appeal before me. Further, these examples do not justify the harm of the proposal to the character and appearance of the area.
7. The proposed external staircase to the rear would be a relatively minor addition in comparison to the host property. Its steel framed construction and balustrade further reduce its visual bulk and achieves a level of permeance preventing it from appearing over dominant when viewed from the surrounding properties.
8. As such, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it would conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) (the London Plan), and Policies 7B and 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) (the DPD). When read together these require development to enhance local context and complement the street.

Living Conditions

9. The rear garden of the appeal site adjoins that of No 12, with the garden of No 10 close to the rear elevation of the appeal property. The proposed external staircase would project above the boundary treatment of the rear garden with the platform to the first floor of the appeal property approximately two metres high, close to the rear gardens of No 10 and No 12. The proposed staircase would be used as access and egress and therefore unlikely to be utilised for long periods of time. Nonetheless given its elevated position and close relationship with the shared boundary, it would offer its users unrestricted views of the rear garden areas of No 10 and No 12, having an unacceptable effect on the privacy of their occupiers.
10. As such, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 10 Evelyn Road and 12 Evelyn Road with particular regard to privacy. Accordingly, it would conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan and 7B of the DPD. When read together these require development to ensure good levels of privacy.

Conclusion

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

N Unwin

INSPECTOR