



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2020

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/20/3244744

27 Gosling Close, Greenford UB6 9UE

- 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 Brian Murray against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 194044FUL, dated 27 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as the demolition of existing disused garage and new build two bedroom single dwelling house, with garden and drive, to the side of existing family home.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is located within an established residential area and I noted at the site visit that there was a clear pattern of development, despite alterations to a number of the nearby properties, of reasonably well proportioned dwellings usually set within good sized plots with space to the front and side. The site consists of the garden area to the side of the host property and by virtue of the its position adjacent to the turning head at the end of the road benefits from considerable frontage onto Gosling Close.
4. Nonetheless, the appeal site is not substantial and the submitted plans show that the proposed property has been designed with a staggered front elevation, including an overhang at the first floor. It is not clear from the submitted plans whether all of the proposed building, in particular the overhang, is accommodated within the appeal site.
5. The appellant details that the proposed dwelling would maintain a reasonable separation from the host property, 27 Gosling Close. This appears broadly consistent with other properties in the area. I note that the submitted plans show that the proposed dwelling is of a similar height, in particular the roof and eaves, to the adjacent property.

6. However, as a result of the constrained nature of the site in combination with the siting, design and scale of the proposed dwelling, I find that the appeal scheme would appear as an incongruous feature harming the character and appearance of the area.
7. As such, the proposed development is contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) (LP) and policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Plan (2013) (the EDMP) that, amongst other matters seek to protect the local character of the area.

Living Conditions

8. The proposed dwelling would be in close proximity to 8 Kensington Road, situated to the rear of the appeal site. The appellant details that the rear garden of No.8 is 10 metres deep and the Council details that the rear windows of the proposed house would be 5 metres from the rear boundary. Taken together, I understand that there would be approximately 15m metres separating the rear elevation of No.8 and the proposed dwelling.
9. I note that the submitted plans show that the windows to the ground and first floor of the rear elevation would be set at an oblique angle, such that they would not directly face those of No.8. Nonetheless, the rear windows of the proposed property would afford future occupiers of the appeal scheme clear views towards the rear windows and garden area of No.8 as shown on the submitted plans.
10. As a result of this limited separation distances and relationship of the appeal scheme and neighbouring property, I find that the proposed development would result in an unacceptable overlooking and subsequent loss of privacy for the occupiers of neighbouring properties contrary to policy 7B of the EDMP and policy 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) insofar as they seek to protect the living conditions of existing occupiers.

Other matters

11. That the appeal scheme would provide an additional dwelling within an existing built up area, with reasonable access to public transport is a material consideration that weighs in favour of the appeal scheme. This does not however outweigh harm to the character and appearance of the area and to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties that I have previously identified.

Conclusion

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

Mark Brooker

INSPECTOR