



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2019

by A Denby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/19/3236575

23 Northwood Gardens, Greenford, UB6 0LE

- 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 & Mrs Seennapen against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref: 192449HH, dated 3 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is single and double storey rear extension, loft conversion with proposed rear and side dormers, new roof lights to the front roof. Minor alterations to the front porch roof style.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The proposals were amended during the application process. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the scheme on which the Council took its decision, the drawings for which were referred to in the Council's decision notice.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling, located at the end of a linear arrangement of development along Northwood Gardens. To the south of the site are residential properties which face on to Whitton Avenue East and are at a substantially lower ground level than the appeal site. The gardens of those properties extend up to Northwood Gardens, with many having single storey detached rear garages adjacent to the highway.
5. The low level of this adjacent development, and the presence of an access way adjacent to the site boundary, results in the site and this part of Northwood Gardens having an open and spacious character. I saw on my site visit that, whilst there may be some variation, the building widths of adjacent properties on Northwood Gardens are largely similar to the appeal site. It appears that the size and design of previous extensions at the appeal site has likely given rise to the building having a bulkier appearance than others in the vicinity. The

appeal property also occupies a more prominent position, with its side elevation being clearly visible from the street.

6. The appeal scheme proposes a substantial two-storey rear extension and box-style dormer window to the rear roof slope. Due to its depth, width and resulting crown roof arrangement, which is not characteristic of the surrounding area, the rear extension would appear as a bulky and dominant addition. It would compete visually with the scale of the existing building, increasing its prominence within the street scene.
7. In isolation the size and design of the proposed rear dormer would be in keeping with the existing property. However, the combination of the roof design to the two-storey rear extension and proposed dormer window would result in a complicated and awkward roof arrangement that would lack architectural subtlety and would not complement the simple style and design of the host property.
8. Whilst the development would utilise materials that would broadly match those used in the existing building, and the dormer would be inset from the side elevation and lower than the existing roof ridge, its intersection with the roof of the rear extension is not well considered. Considering the open character of development adjacent to the site it would also be a prominent and incongruous addition within the street scene. On this basis I conclude that together, the proposed two-storey rear extension and rear dormer roof addition, would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene.
9. The proposed single storey rear extension and alterations to the front canopy would not result in harm to the host dwelling or street scene. The appellant has also attempted to address the Council's objections to a previous scheme on the site. Whilst the development would also raise no concerns in relation to impact on the living conditions of adjacent properties, I consider these matters would have a neutral effect, and therefore do not weigh in favour of the appeal. It is also noted that the proposal would provide additional living accommodation for the appellant, though I am mindful that this benefit would be personal to the appellant and would not outweigh the harm I have identified.
10. The proposals would therefore be contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management, Development Plan Document (2012) and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) which seek to ensure that proposals complement their street sequence, scale and mass and achieves a high quality of development. For the same reasons the proposal would also not accord with Supplementary Planning Document: SPD4 – Residential Extensions and the high-quality design requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has also drawn my attention to other extensions in the vicinity of the site and I saw on my site visit that there is a wide variety of house styles and designs in the wider area, many of which have been extended in differing styles. There are none which appear to be directly comparable to the appeal site when considering siting, design or prominence within the street scene. Furthermore, I do not know the full circumstances of those schemes, and in any event I have determined this appeal on its own merits. These other matters do not, therefore, lead me to a different conclusion.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Denby

INSPECTOR