



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2020

by R Walker BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/20/3248675

18 Grove Road, Ealing, London W5 5DS

- 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 Brian G Rayment against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 194178HH, dated 26 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2019.
 - The development proposed was originally described as erection of first floor rear extension to provide bedroom to enable an upstairs bathroom and larger ground floor kitchen to be provided.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and the Ealing Town Centre Conservation Area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupier of No 17 Grove Road (No 17) with particular reference to light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property forms part of a Victorian Terrace within the Ealing Town Centre Conservation Area (CA). Although there is some variation, the repetition of the terraced housing within this part of the CA is an important component of its significance.
4. Properties in the terrace are small, albeit to varying degrees, have small rear gardens and are tightly knit, resulting in an intimate character. Properties within the terrace have been extended to varying levels, mostly single storey with few first floor extensions.
5. The proposal would project out further than the first floor extension at the adjacent dwelling. Although this would align with the ground floor extension at the host property and would be smaller than the extension at No 16 Grove Road (No 16), it would, nonetheless be a dominant feature to the rear in this intimate setting.

6. Whilst I recognise that the extension at No 16 is an existing feature of the terrace, the Council advise that it does not have planning permission and I do not know the circumstances that led to its being. Moreover, it served to confirm how such extensions to the rear can appear unduly dominant in this tightly knit row of terrace properties.
7. Although the proposed materials would be appropriate, the proposed development would, in my view, appear out of proportion and at odds with the host property. It would therefore be an unsympathetic addition which would have a harmful effect on the appearance at the rear of the host property and terrace group. Due to its rear location it would not be appreciated from wider public views within the CA. However, it would be seen from private views and even cumulative and incremental localised changes of this kind can erode the character and quality of an area. I therefore find that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.
8. I accept that the appellant is seeking to make an effective use of the dwelling improving the living conditions. However, the overall benefits to the public would be limited. Heritage assets are irreplaceable and great weight should be given to their conservation. Therefore, as set out in paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), there are no public benefits that outweigh the less than substantial harm that would occur in this case.
9. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with the objectives of the SPD4 - Residential Extensions (SPD), Ealing Town Centre Conservation Area Management Plan 2007. Moreover, it would conflict with the requirements of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) (LP), Policies 7B and 7.4 of the Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) (DPD) and the Framework. These stipulate, amongst other things, that development should compliment the existing built areas street scene, building pattern, scale, materials and detailing.

Living conditions

10. The first floor bedroom window at No 17 would be positioned between the proposed extension and the existing extension at No 16. I have no substantive evidence before me as to the extent of any loss of light and given the direction of the appeal property it is reasonable to conclude that there would be no significant shadowing effects.
11. The private view from a window is not of itself regarded as a planning matter. However, in certain circumstances the change of view for an individual may have an impact, to such an extent, on the residential amenities enjoyed by the property that it constitutes a planning consideration. In this regard, the first floor window would have the massing of the extension at No 16 and the proposal either side and, due to the tightly knit nature of the terrace properties and the extent of projection this combination would, in my view, result in an unduly hemmed in feeling and sense of enclosure.
12. Although the occupant of the neighbouring property supports the proposal, I must also consider the living conditions of future occupiers and, in this respect, the support does not outweigh the harm I have identified on this matter.

13. I therefore find that the proposal would result in significant harm to the outlook from the first floor bedroom window and thus, have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupier of No 17. The proposal would therefore conflict with the objectives of the SPD and the requirements of Policy 7.6 of the LP, Policy 7B of the DPD and the Framework. These broadly seek to ensure good standards of living conditions for existing occupants, amongst other things.

Conclusion

14. I have taken account of all the other matters raised including the benefits of the proposal to the living conditions at the host property. However, none changes the balance of these findings and the harm I have identified to the CA and living conditions of the occupier of No 17.
15. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

Robert Walker

INSPECTOR