
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2019

by J Williamson BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/19/3231205

39 Nutfield Gardens, Northolt UB5 6LU

- 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 Kieran Collins against the decision of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 190913FUL, dated 25 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear/side extension; and single storey front porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for single-storey rear/side extension; and single-storey front porch extension, at 39 Nutfield Gardens, Northolt UB5 6LU, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 19091FUL, dated 25 February 2019, subject to the conditions outlined below:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: SK 100 P1, SK101 P1.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development provided on the application form is "entrance porch and rear kitchen extension." The description provided on the appeal form is single storey rear/side extension; and single storey front porch extension, and it is stated on the appeal form that the description hasn't changed from that stated on the application form...though it clearly has. The description provided on the Council's decision notice is "single storey rear/side extension; and single storey front porch extension." As the proposed kitchen extension is to both the side and the rear, I have used what I consider to be the more accurate description, and it is one that both parties agree to and use on the documents referred to.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The application site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling with a single-storey garage attached to the side that has been extended to the rear. The garage has a flat roof positioned behind a brick parapet wall at the front. The main roof is dual-pitched, hipped at the side. There is a bay window on the front elevation running from ground through to first-floor which has a dual-pitched roof, hipped at the front. The external materials are mainly red-brick, pebble-dash render, hung tiles between the ground and first-floor bay windows and a red tiled roof. The property is set-back from the adjacent footpath approximately 6m.
5. The area is characterised by mainly two-storey, semi-detached dwellings with dual-pitched roofs, hipped at the side. Most have been designed with a single-storey attached garage with flat roof behind a parapet wall at the front. Several properties have altered the parapet wall by, for example, increasing its height or altering it to a hipped design. Some have installed a shallow, mono-pitched roof over the garage. Many of the properties have bay windows extending off the front elevations with roofs hipped at the front. Some have converted the garage to habitable space, extended over it and/or added porches or canopies at the front.
6. The key issue relates to the design of the roof of the proposed side/rear extension and the effect on the architectural integrity of the original dwelling. The side/rear extension would extend beyond the main rear elevation approximately 3.1 m and would be approximately 4 m wide, with the outer elevation extending up to the side boundary, in-line with the existing side extension/garage. The roof of the proposed extension would in part extend over the existing extension sited behind the garage. The roof would be dual-pitched, with the pitch angle matching that of the main roof hip. The extension would have a rear gable elevation and a gable to its roof at the front, positioned at the point where the flat roof of the garage joins with the existing extension to the rear of it, ie approximately 5 m back from the front elevation. The height of the roof ridge would be approximately 3.8 m.
7. I acknowledge that most of the single-storey extensions undertaken to properties along Nutfield Gardens have shallow, mono-pitched roofs below the height of 3.8 m. However, the appeal property is set forward of the neighbouring property to the side of the garage, No. 37, and angled a little towards it. No. 37 has a two-storey side extension, with a single-storey extension to the side of this, taking the mass of the dwelling up to the boundary with the appeal site, thereby reducing the gap between the properties and the extent of what can be viewed from the street.
8. Furthermore, one side of the proposed gable roof slope at the front would be shorter than the other, as the proposed extension extends a little around the rear of the property. The front gable would be set approximately 5 m behind the existing brick parapet wall at the front of the garage and, taking account of the depth of the front driveway, it would be positioned approximately 11 m from the footpath. The siting of the proposed extension is such that, walking

along Nutfield Gardens in either direction, it would only be visible when one is stood either virtually directly in front of the appeal site on its side of the street, or along the stretch of the street between numbers 18 to 22, on the opposite side of the road. With such restricted public views, I consider the siting, design and size would not harm the architectural integrity of the host property and therefore would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the area.

9. As such, the proposed single-storey side/rear extension would accord with policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document, 2013, 1.1 of the Ealing's Development Strategy 2026 Development Plan Document, 2012, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, 2016, and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which, collectively, and amongst other things, seek to ensure developments provide high quality architectural and urban design, complement existing building patterns, their scale and detailing, are visually attractive and sympathetic to the local character.

Other Matters

10. The Council considers the proposed single-storey front porch to be of an acceptable scale and bulk and not to harm the visual amenity of the street-scene. I also consider the siting, design and size of the proposed porch to have an acceptable relationship with the host dwelling and the street-scene and not to harm the character or appearance of the area.

Conditions

11. I have applied standard conditions regarding timescale, plans and materials, as suggested by the Council, to ensure works are completed in a timely manner, in accordance with the plans and to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. In light of the above, the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions listed.

J Williamson

INSPECTOR