
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 March 2017

by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 13 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/16/3164111

Rear of 2-10 Northfield Avenue, West Ealing W13 9RJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Andrew Papacosta against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 161151FUL, dated 22 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is the retention of single storey timber canopy structure (with UPVC sheet enclosure) (Retrospective Application).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and unconditional planning permission is granted for the retention of single storey timber canopy structure (with UPVC sheet enclosure) (Retrospective Application) at the rear of 2-10 Northfield Avenue, West Ealing W13 9RJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 161151FUL, dated 22 March 2016.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of development as it appears on the appeal form. Whilst this differs from that shown on the planning application form, it most accurately describes the development to which the appeal relates. It is clear that the Council are content with this approach since the same description appears on their decision notice. I have proceeded on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is at the end of a row of two storey mainly bay fronted dwellings set back from the pavement. There is some design and frontage variation in the street scene but for the most part a degree of uniformity in its general form and appearance. The development is a single storey wooden structure, supporting a dual pitched polycarbonate roof. It is attached to the ground as well as affixed to the surrounding brick walls.
 5. The design, siting and materials used in the construction of the enclosure do make the development stand out. However, it is in my view a well-executed
-

simple design constructed in natural timber which is not overly bulky in its profile. The roof material is slim and is not a dominant element of its design and appearance when viewed from street level. I have no doubt that it is more visible from the upper floors of adjacent dwellings but it is read in the context of the use of similar materials over rear garden spaces.

6. The development is subservient to surrounding built form and there is a single storey garage with a roller shutter door immediately opposite. Covered off street parking arrangements are therefore not uncommon in the street scene.
7. When taking all of these matters together, the fact that the development has a contrasting appearance in the street scene does not amount to harm to it. As such, I do not find that the development is unacceptable in the context of the character and appearance of the area. Consequently there is no conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, Policy 1.1 of the Core Strategy¹ or Policy 7B of the Development Management DPD².
8. These Policies, along with section 7 of the Framework³, seek to ensure that, amongst other things, new development is of a high quality and contextually appropriate design and appearance and the character of areas is not adversely affected.
9. I note the Council's reference to Policy 1.2 of the Core Strategy and Policy 7A of the Development Management DPD. On my reading of the former, it appears to be more relevant to how the Council's strategic vision objectives will be delivered. With regards to 7A, this appears to be more relevant to matters of amenity, specifically emissions from development and how it may affect sensitive uses. I do not therefore consider these policies to be directly relevant to the main issue in this case.

Other Matters

10. I note concern that has been expressed by local residents that the appellant is operating a car washing business from the appeal site. I have not been provided with any further evidence of this. In any event the use of the appeal site is not a matter before me in the determination of this appeal.
11. Further comments have been made concerning how busy traffic is in the area and pressure for parking on the street. These are made in the context of a recently approved flat development that may exacerbate the situation. Whilst the development is unlikely to have any significant bearing on the amount of traffic in the area, the development allows for the parking of a single vehicle off the road and as such would be positive for the concerns that have been raised.

Conditions

12. The Council have not provided any suggested conditions. However, as the appeal seeks retrospective planning permission and I am satisfied that the external appearance and siting of the development are acceptable; I am content that the planning permission hereby granted is unconditional.

¹ Ealing Development Strategy 2026 (2012)

² Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2012)

³ The National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, the appeal is allowed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR