
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2020

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/20/3256331

2 Argus Way, Northolt UB5 6EQ

- 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 S Ghimire against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 201135HH, dated 16 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is second floor extension for habitable use.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed second floor extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a flat roof situated close to the junction of Argus Way and Wayfarer Road. The proposal would involve the construction of a second floor extension that extends across the full width of the house and would be constructed with a flat roof.
4. It is located within a mature well-established high density residential area, typically characterised by two storey terraced and semi-detached properties, with some three storey dwellings nearby. The two storey properties within the immediate vicinity are relatively evenly spaced, of comparable scale and form, with square proportions and a flat roofed construction. These features give the area a strong unifying character and appearance.
5. Although the proposed extension would not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size, the scale and form of the proposed extension would nevertheless still be a significant addition relative to the main property and would fail to respect the established pattern and layout of the area.
6. These shortcomings would be exacerbated by the proposal's prominent position, which would be visible from a number of public vantage points along Argus Way and Wayfarer Road. The proposed extension, by virtue of its scale, siting and design, would fail to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination

to the host property and would result in an incongruous and out-of-keeping addition that would cause unacceptable harm to the area.

7. I have considered the appellant's arguments that the design and layout of the proposed extension have been carefully considered in order to minimise any adverse impacts on the host property and the area. However, whilst the use of matching materials, fenestrations and a flat roof design would assist in integrating the proposal with the host property and the area, these aspects do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above.
8. Consequently, I conclude that the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) and Policy 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013). These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is of a high quality of design that complements the local context in terms of appearance, scale and design of the scheme and responds to the character of the area.

Other Matters

9. I have noted the other developments in the area drawn to my attention by the appellant. However, the flat roofed second floor extension to the property on Chipmunk Grove is of a different scale and form to the appeal scheme and was built in a different policy context. In any event, each proposal falls to be assessed primarily on its own merits and this does not set a precedent for such an inappropriate development in this location for the reasons set out above.
10. I note the appellant's comments regarding the various benefits arising from the proposal including the scheme's high quality design and providing additional accommodation to meet the family's needs. While I have given them some weight, these benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified. For all these reasons, there are no other material considerations to outweigh the development plan conflicts identified.

Conclusion

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

David Troy

INSPECTOR