



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2019

by William Walton BA MSc Dip Env Law LLM CPE BVC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/19/3239053

85 Hazelmere Walk, Northolt UB5 6UR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Baxter against the decision of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 193150HH, dated 7 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an end terraced 2-storey dwelling occupying a large, prominent corner plot on Hazelmere Walk in Northolt. Most of the dwellings within the vicinity of the appeal site are 2-storey and are arranged in terraces containing 4-6 properties. The neighbourhood generally has quite an open appearance.
4. A lean-to garage is attached to the side of the dwelling. At the rear of the dwelling is an extension measuring the full width of the property at ground floor level and approximately half width at first-floor level. To the other side of the garage is quite a large area of ground enclosed by a solid wooden fence. Beyond this fence and facing the side of the appeal property over a short section of road are other terraced properties (Nos 81-84), also on Hazelmere Walk. The appeal property looks over a large area of open grassland to the rear.
5. The proposed development involves removal of the lean-to garage and construction of a two-storey side extension to accommodate a hallway and family room on the ground floor and 4 bedrooms with en-suite bathrooms on the first-floor. In line with the Council's Interim Planning Guidance SPD 4: Residential Extensions (undated) (SPD) the extension would be set back slightly from the front of the existing property at first-floor level and set down slightly from the roof ridge line. The roof of the extension would match the pitch of the host building. It would incorporate a set of double doors and

- window to the front, windows at first-floor level to the side and 4 windows and patio doors to the rear.
6. According to the appellant, the extension would measure around 9 metres in width. This is considerably wider than the existing dwelling. It would run the full depth of the dwelling which, according to the appellant, is just over 11 metres at ground floor level and just over 10 metres at first floor level. The flank wall of the proposal would not look any more intrusive than the existing flank which has near identical dimensions. Further, although the flank wall would be moved closer to Nos 81-84, the generous size of the site would ensure that the overall pattern of development was maintained.
 7. However, because of its size and bulk, the set back of the front elevation at first-floor level and the set down of the roof level would not succeed in making the extension appear to be subordinate to the original dwelling. When viewed from the east the extension would, because of its considerable width, look more like one, or even two, separate dwellings rather than part of the existing house. This would be contrary to the advice in the SPD that side extensions should not detract from the original building and should appear as being subordinate.
 8. Although it is noted that there is some variation in the design and scale of the dwellings in the same terrace the appeal proposal would be considerably larger and more dominant than any of these. As such, it would be detrimental to both the architectural quality of the host building and that of the street scene where the dwellings are all of approximately equal width. The undoubted ability of the generous sized plot to accommodate this extension cannot change this finding.
 9. To the rear the development proposal would run flush with the existing part two-storey extension and would incorporate the same roof line. Therefore, when viewed from the rear the proposal would appear to be a continuation of the existing extension and, again, would fail to be a subordinate element.
 10. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the proposed extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. It would thus be contrary to Policy 7.4 of the Council's Development Management: Development Plan Document 2013 (DPD) which seeks to ensure that new development respects the scale and building pattern of its surroundings and conforms to the local street sequence. It would also be contrary to the design standards as regards scale set out in the SPD. Since this document seeks to implement council design policies, I give it a moderate amount of weight. Because it would fail to meet these design standards it would also fail to comply with Policy 7B of the DPD which requires their achievement.
 11. Further, it would be contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 (LP) which seek to ensure that new development is of a high-quality design, is in proportion to surrounding buildings and enhances the local architecture.

Other Matters

12. The issue of the number of windows on the side elevation is not a matter of direct relevance to the dispute between the parties and so I have not considered it in this decision.

13. I note that the proposal would allow the appellant to secure affordable extended accommodation. I also note that the new accommodation might be accessible to wheelchair users which could be of potential benefit to current and future occupants. However, these considerations do not outweigh my findings in regard to the harm that the extension would cause to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
14. Some objectors referred to a restrictive covenant prohibiting various forms of development on the estate. I was not provided with a copy of this document which, for the avoidance of doubt, has not informed my decision.

Conclusions

15. For the reasons set out above I dismiss this appeal.

William Walton

INSPECTOR

