



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2021

**by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 24 February 2021**

---

## **Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/20/3262788**

### **1 Birkbeck Avenue, Greenford, UB6 8LS**

- 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 Ayaze Mohammed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
  - The application Ref 203035HH, dated 4 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 September 2020.
  - The development proposed is a part single storey rear extension and two storey rear and side extension.
- 

## **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## **Procedural Matters**

2. The appeal property was recently granted planning permission<sup>1</sup> for a part single storey, part two storey side/rear wrap around extension incorporating external stairs at ground floor rear elevation (following demolition of existing attached garage).

## **Main Issue**

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area. Whilst there are similarities to this previously permitted proposal, the proposed development the subject of this appeal includes a number of significant differences. The proposal before me would be built up to the flank boundary with a splayed side building line and greater width; and the proposed extension to the first floor would have an increased width when compared to the previous permission.
4. Taking these and other differences into consideration, I am mindful that the proposal would appear larger, taller and wider than that previously permitted.

## **Reasons**

5. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached brick-built dwelling with a small attached garage to the side. It is located within a residential area and is situated in a prominent position close to the entrance into Birkbeck Avenue from Oldfield Lane North.

---

<sup>1</sup> Reference: Application Ref 190067HH.

---

6. The surrounding area is characterised by the presence of, largely, two storey semi-detached brick-built dwellings of a similar period and character. Houses tend to be set back from the road behind short parking areas and/or gardens and with longer gardens to the rear.
7. The setting back of housing from the street combines with gaps between pairs of dwellings and the presence of occasional street trees, to provide the area with a sense of spaciousness. Further, the common use of materials, similarities in house design and the presence of an ornate, low brick-built boundary wall, common to many properties, affords the area an attractive uniformity. This is not diminished by numerous properties having been altered and/or extended over time, as the majority of such changes largely appear in keeping with host properties and their surroundings.
8. During my site visit, I observed that the side and rear of the appeal property appear prominently in various views from Oldfield Lane North, a busy thoroughfare, as well as from a car park immediately adjacent to the appeal property.
9. The proposed development would extend the appeal property to the side and rear. It would result in a somewhat unusual wedge shape to the side and rear at first floor level, whereby the proposal would lead the first floor to “splay” out, resulting in a very wide first floor rear extension relative to the size of the property. As such, the proposal would appear out of scale with, rather than subordinate to, the host property.
10. In addition to this, the shape, scale and first floor height of this element of the proposal would, I find, lead it to draw attention to itself as an incongruous feature that would unduly dominate the side and rear elevations of the appeal property. The harmful impacts of this would be exacerbated as a result of No 1 Birkbeck Avenue’s prominent location.
11. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the Framework, to London Plan (2016) Policies 7.4 and 7.6, and to DPD<sup>2</sup> Policy 7.4, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

## **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

*N McGurk*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>2</sup> Reference: Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013).