
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2021

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/20/3261781
198A Greenford Avenue, Hanwell W7 3QT

- 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 Ealing Asset Management Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 202098FUL, dated 1 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a rear and side extension to existing ground floor apartment.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 196 Greenford Avenue with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal relates to a semi-detached property which has been converted to two flats. The proposal seeks to erect a single storey rear extension with a staggered footprint. It would occupy just over half of the depth of the rear outrigger, projecting along the boundary with No. 200 Greenford Avenue. It would also project a considerable distance along the boundary with No. 196 Greenford Avenue. Its widest section would occupy the full width of the plot.
 4. An adequately sized amenity space would remain and the proposed extension would be finished in appropriate external materials. However, the staggered footprint of the extension which would wrap around the outrigger, combined with its asymmetrical roof, would pay little regard to the traditional arrangement and form of the host dwelling, even accounting for the fact that the angles of its roof pitches would replicate those of the outrigger and main roof. As a result, I consider that the proposed extension would appear as a somewhat awkward and incongruous addition. In this respect, it conflicts with
-

policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan (LP) and policies 7.4 and 7B of the adopted Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (EDMDPD) which promote high quality design that is appropriate to its context.

Living conditions

5. According to the undisputed figures provided by the Council, the proposed extension would project some 6.8 metres from the outrigger of the appeal property. The attached property, No. 196 Greenford Avenue, has an attached outrigger of the same depth and the proposed extension would project directly along the common boundary. The proposed extension would replace an existing flat roof extension which projects from the rear of the outrigger along the boundary with No. 196, but it would be much deeper.
6. This attached dwelling does not have a ground floor window on the rear elevation of its outrigger. I am also satisfied that the proposed extension would not cast undue shadow on this property as it would sit on the northern boundary. However, I consider that the additional depth of the proposed extension would be unacceptably overbearing and oppressive for the occupiers of No. 196 when enjoying their outside space. Whilst the Appellant Company has suggested that the eaves height of the extension could be reduced to 2.5 metres, I must consider the proposal as presented.
7. Despite a lack of formal objection from the occupiers of No. 196 Greenford Avenue, I therefore find that the proposal would have an overbearing effect on this property. In this respect too, it would conflict with policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the LP and policy 7B of the EDMDPD, which also seek to safeguard appropriate levels of residential amenity.

Other considerations

8. The Appellant Company argues that much larger extensions are permitted in more sensitive and affluent areas. This is a general assertion which is not supported by any persuasive evidence. I have considered the appeal proposal on its individual merits in any event.
9. The Appellant Company also asserts that the proposed extension would upgrade the ground floor apartment and make effective use of the outside space and therefore amounts to sustainable development. The National Planning Policy Framework explains that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. As I have found that the proposal would not sit comfortably alongside the host property, it does not amount to good design in this particular context. It therefore does not amount to sustainable development in the widest sense of the definition provided by the Framework.

Overall Conclusions

10. I conclude that the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and it would have an overbearing effect on the occupiers of No. 196 Greenford Avenue when enjoying their outside space. The arguments advanced by the Appellant Company do not outweigh this harm and the associated policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon INSPECTOR