



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 16 November 2020

by M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/20/3247448

Land to the Rear 1 Golden Manor, Ealing W7 3EN

- 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 Ms M.E Ambo against the decision of London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 195225FUL, dated 9 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as construction of a single storey detached dwelling house with basement, refuse and cycle storage, access from Alwyne Road to rear of 1 Golden Manor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have taken the site address from the appeal form as it is the clearest description of the site location.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - Whether the development proposed would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hanwell Village Green Conservation Area; and,
 - The effect of the development proposed on living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to No 3 Golden Manor.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site lies within the Hanwell Village Green Conservation Area (the CA). The surrounding character is principally suburban with housing in the vicinity of the site primarily comprising two-storey dwellings, although there are also single-storey houses in the street scene. A railway viaduct lies a short distance from the site, with businesses occupying some of the viaduct's arches. There is an area of open space opposite the site.
5. The development proposed would result in the erection of a single-storey dwelling in the gap between the host dwelling and the neighbouring property, No 2 Alwyne Road. The appeal site is a prominent gap in the street scene that contributes, together with the open space opposite, to its overall sense of spaciousness.

6. The proposed dwelling would occupy much of the plot and be close to three of the four site boundaries. The limited garden areas to the front and rear of the house would fail to provide meaningful separation resulting in a cramped scale of development out of keeping with the wider character of the CA, where houses typically sit comfortably within their plots with spacious gardens.
7. The appeal proposals include the erection of a wall to the street boundary that would be taller than the existing fence. This would largely screen the proposed house in the street scene, but due to its greater height it would be an incongruous feature in the street scene that would detract from its spacious character. If the appeal were to be allowed a revised boundary treatment could potentially be secured by condition, but this would result in the proposed house being more prominent within the street scene, and therefore the development proposed would still result in a loss of spaciousness. As the existing fence is adjacent to the highway it could not be replaced with a taller fence or wall under Permitted Development.
8. The appeal proposal would consequently fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. The harm arising from the development proposed would be localised in the vicinity of the appeal site with the loss of spaciousness perceived in the street scene and from neighbouring properties. It would therefore amount to less than substantial harm, when weighed against the significance of the CA as a whole.
9. There would be benefits from the development proposed. It would deliver an additional unit of housing, which is an objective of both local and national policy. The appeal site is in a sustainable location. It would bring an active use to a vacant site that has been severed from the host dwelling. The proposed house would have a sedum roof. Cumulatively these benefits attract moderate weight, given that the development is of modest scale.
10. Great weight must be accorded to the conservation of designated heritage assets in accordance with Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework. In this instance, the moderate weight given to the benefits associated with the appeal proposal would not outweigh the identified harm.
11. The development proposed would therefore conflict with Policies 1.1 and 2.10 of the Ealing Development Strategy 2026 (the DS), 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Plan Document 2013 (the DMPD) and 3.5, 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 (the LP). These policies seek, amongst other things, appropriate levels of development on site and that development complement the street sequence and building pattern in existing built areas.

Living Conditions

12. The height of the boundary fence to 3 Golden Manor would be significantly increased to screen the proposed house from the occupants of No 3. This would result in a greater sense of enclosure to the garden of No 3, which is already partly overshadowed by the house at 1 Golden Manor. The proposed house would be set at a lower ground level to No 3, and there would be separation between the shared boundary and the proposed house for much of its length. The benefit of the screening from the higher fence would be limited as the proposed house would not generally be an unduly prominent feature when seen from the garden of No 3. The increased height of the fence would therefore

result in a loss of outlook harmful to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers that would not be outweighed by its benefits.

13. The development proposed would therefore conflict with Policies 7B of the DMPD, 1.1 of the DS and 7.4 and 7.6 of the LP. Taken together these require that development not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings.

Other Matters

14. My attention has been drawn to other permissions granted in the borough and elsewhere in London. The permission granted for a new house on Ainsdale Road in the borough was on a site not within a CA, and there was a previous permission for development of the site that was a consideration in granting approval. The circumstances therefore are different to this appeal. Limited information has been provided about the permission granted for a site in the Hanger Hill Estate CA, but as the permission was for a two-storey house with a rear amenity space and associated timber decking it appears that there are significant differences between that proposal and site and that which is before me. I have therefore afforded these decisions limited weight in my consideration of this appeal.
15. The permission granted in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea, and the guidance issued by the London Borough of Islington, relate to different local authorities with their own development plans. I therefore afford these considerations very limited weight in determining this appeal.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons set out above, the appeal fails.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR