



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2020

by Jonathon Parsons MSc BSc(Hons) DipTP Cert(Urb) MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3247511

37 Blenheim Road, Northolt UB5 4TW

- 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 and Mrs Lulzim Krasniqi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 194438HH, dated 16 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first floor and roof extension to existing detached house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two storey dwelling at the end of a parking court with access off Blenheim Road. The dwelling has a flat roofed single storey extension to the rear. Uniquely, the appeal property has a large rear garden which extends behind the gardens of adjacent terraced dwellings. An access way serves it from the street behind, between 65 and 67 Gonville Crescent.
4. On different sides of the appeal dwelling, there is a row of terraced two storey dwellings and a three storey block of flats. Dwellings and gardens of properties on Gonville Crescent back onto the dwelling and the residential development either side of it. To one side of the appeal property's large rear garden, there is a recent development comprising semi-detached dwellings at Childs Terrace.
5. The extension would involve the raising of the appeal dwelling's roof to a point midway between the two buildings either side of it. The first floor would not extend out significantly beyond the neighbouring block of flats. There would also be a lack of public view of the development, including the elongated pitched roof over the extended first floor. Views of these roof alterations from surrounding properties would not generally stand out due to distance and the fact that the roof pitch angle would not be significantly different to those around.

6. However, the first floor projection would noticeably project beyond the terraced dwelling on one side and would extend across the full width of the host dwelling. The second floor dormer would be substantial in depth and width, dominating the roof that it would be situated upon, and would be a prominent feature visible from surrounding properties. There are dormers within the area, but they are not overriding features of the area. Where they exist, such as on the rear roof slopes of dwellings on Childs Terrace, they are considerably smaller and less dominant. For all these reasons, the extensions would represent an incongruous and obtrusive overdevelopment of the site by reason of extension's design, mass and bulk.
7. There are other examples of extended dwellings within the area but within the vicinity of the appeal site, none were found to be similar in size and nature, as that before me, on my site visit. In any case, every proposal has to be considered on its particular merits, as has been done so here.
8. For all these reasons, the development would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would not complement street sequence, building pattern, scale and detailing in the locality. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD) 2013 and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (LP) 2016.
9. The extensions would provide additional habitable accommodation for the appellant's growing family and would represent a viable alternative to the substantial cost of moving home. However, personal circumstances will seldom outweigh the more general planning considerations as works of a permanent nature will remain long after they have ceased to be material. The development would have a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area for the reasons indicated. Moreover, it has not been demonstrated that there are no other solutions to providing the family accommodation. For all these reasons, the personal circumstances in this case are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that would arise if the appeal were to be allowed.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area in conflict with DPD and LP policies and the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations of sufficient weight to outweigh that finding.
11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathon Parsons

INSPECTOR