

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/D/20/3264069
9 Greenford Gardens, Greenford UB6 9LY

- 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 David Kubyk against the decision of Ealing Council.
 - The application Ref 203407HH, dated 25 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is 'sides and rear (wrap around) roof extensions'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a modest, hipped roofed detached bungalow style property. It sits within a residential road which is home to a range of dwelling types.
4. The proposal seeks to introduce box style dormers to each side of the bungalow, wrapping around almost the full width of the rear elevation. The box dormers would be very large, sitting just above the eaves and just below the ridge. At the rear, the addition would have the appearance of a first floor flat roof extension.
5. The proposed wrap around dormers would be broadly balanced and they would not impact unduly on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. Nevertheless, they would engulf the modest hipped roof of the appeal dwelling and would give it a boxy, top heavy appearance. The additions would not respond well to the scale and form of the existing dwelling and they would appear as unsympathetic, overly dominant and incongruous additions.
6. This visual harm would be readily visible from certain vantage points along Greenford Gardens. Whilst I acknowledge that other box dormers are found within this part of Greenford Gardens, I do not know the precise planning circumstances behind them. In any event, they are not positive elements of the street scene in my view and this proposal would inflict further visual harm.

7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the box style dormer additions would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits. In such terms, the proposal conflicts with policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan and policies 7.4 and 7B of the adopted Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document, which promote high quality design that respects and strengthens local character.
8. The arguments advanced by the Appellant in favour of the proposal do not outweigh this harm and associated policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR