



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2020 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN MIPI

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/19/3243728

54 and 56 Keats Way, Greenford UB6 9HE

- 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 Akbar Mughal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
- The application Ref 194434FUL, dated 16 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 December 2019.
- The development is front canopy and alterations to front parking amenity space to dwellinghouses.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises two two-storey dwellinghouses on the western side of Keats Way, a residential street which predominantly consists of rows of similar dwellinghouses. While there is some architectural variation along the street, properties are primarily characterised by their two-storey bays and pebble dash render, incorporating either small canopies or small front porches at their entrance. The street therefore has a broadly cohesive and unified appearance. In contrast, the development consists of a large and prominent canopy which spans the full width of the two appeal properties and is set just below the sills of the first-floor windows. At ground-floor level, the canopy is supported by neo-classical style pillars which are entirely uncharacteristic of the street. Due to its excessive width and height, as well as its incongruent design, the development relates poorly to the proportions and character of the host buildings and appears as an overly prominent and discordant feature within the street. It thereby causes unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.
 5. The details and circumstances of examples of similar development cited by the appellant are not before me to consider, and so I cannot determine whether they are directly comparable or relevant to the development. Regardless, while
-

there may be examples of similar development elsewhere within the borough, none of the examples cited by the appellant are situated within the immediate context of the site, nor do they directly contribute to the character of Keats Way. As such, these examples do not establish any precedent for the development, which has been considered on its own merits and determined to cause unacceptable harm for the reasons set out above.

6. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development causes unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. The development therefore conflicts with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) and Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Development Management Development Plan Document (2013), which state that development must be designed to a high standard and respond positively to local character.
7. The development also conflicts with Paragraph 127, Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), which states that development should add to the overall quality of the area and appear sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

8. While I acknowledge that there have been no objections submitted by neighbouring occupants, I have nonetheless found the development to cause unacceptable harm for the reasons stated above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR