



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2020

by A Parkin BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/19/3239099

54 Studland Road, Hanwell, London W7 3QX

- 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 Marcel Horgan of City Central Contracts against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 192912FUL, dated 1 July 2017, was refused by notice dated 25 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of single dwellinghouse into two self-contained flats including associated car parking, cycle storage and refuse storage provision; part single and part two storey side and rear wrap around extension (following demolition of single storey detached garage); part first floor rear extension; alteration of roof from hip to gable; rear roof extension; and installation of two roof lights to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description of development contained on the Council's decision notice, rather than that contained on the application form, because it more clearly describes what is proposed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal building is a traditional hipped roofed, semi-detached dwelling on the northern side of Studland Road. The street slopes upwards quite steeply to the east of No 54, towards Greenford Avenue, which accounts for the different roof ridgeline heights of the pair of semi-detached dwellings that includes the appeal building. Both buildings are rendered but otherwise largely unaltered since their original construction.
5. This is a residential area containing a mix of traditional semi-detached dwellings with gardens to the front and rear, many of which have been extended, and which are occasionally interspersed with detached infill dwellings, such as No 60A, next door to the west of the appeal building.

6. To the rear of the appeal building, beyond its garden, are several 3-storey / 4-storey blocks of flats set within grounds. The end of its garden is marked by a concrete panel fence with a number of mature deciduous trees and bushes. When I visited the site, the boundary treatment allowed for views through from some of the facing flats / grounds towards the rear elevations of the appeal building and its joined next door neighbour.
7. Planning permission has been granted by the Council for a very similar proposal at the appeal building¹. The only significant difference between the appeal proposal and the proposal previously approved is a first floor, hipped roof extension to the rear of the dwelling.
8. The previously approved works would be a significant change to the side and rear elevations of the appeal building. In addition to these works, the proposed first floor extension would be some 3.0 metres wide by 3.0 metres deep and located off-centre on the rear elevation of the dwelling, above part of the previously approved rear ground floor extension. Its hipped roof would extend across part of the rear roofslope to join the end of the previously approved rear dormer roof extension, beneath one of the dormer windows.
9. The proposed first floor rear extension would provide more spacious living accommodation to the upper floors flat. However, its height, position and design, in addition to the previously approved alterations and extensions, would create a sense of visual clutter on the appeal building, visible from both the rear and the side aspects.
10. Furthermore, notwithstanding some alignment of fenestration and that the proposed materials would match the existing, the proposed first floor rear extension would be an incongruous addition to the rear elevation of the building. Its height, design and position would not relate well to the previously approved works. In particular, it would disrupt the appearance of both the rear dormer and the ground floor rear extension with its partly sloped roof.
11. The proposed first floor rear extension would be visible from the joined next door dwelling and from rear gardens along Studland Road, particularly those on higher ground to the east, as well as from parts of the flats development to the rear.
12. For these reasons the proposed first floor rear extension, alongside the previously approved works to the appeal building, would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policies 7.4 (Local Character) and 7B (Design Amenity) of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document December 2013, Policies 7.4 (Local Character) and 7.6 (Architecture) of the London Plan March 2016 and with guidance contained within Chapter 12 (Achieving well-designed places) of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.

Other Matters

13. The submitted evidence shows that the existing off-street parking provision of two spaces would be disrupted as a result of the proposed side extension. The appellant has indicated that two off-street parking spaces would be provided as part of the proposed development². However, none are shown on the

¹ LPA Ref. 191128FUL, approved 7 May 2019.

² Email dated 24 December 2019.

submitted drawings. I also note that the Council has not considered this matter further in its suggested conditions, should the appeal be allowed.

14. A number of third parties have objected to the proposal including with regard to its impact upon car parking in the area. The proposed flat conversion would intensify the use of the appeal building and would be likely to increase the demand for off-street parking provision significantly.
15. Notwithstanding the Council's previous approval for a flat conversion at the appeal property, were I minded to allow this appeal, then car parking provision is something that I would need to consider further. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, such consideration is not necessary in this case.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Parkin

INSPECTOR