

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/20/3260963

1 Croft Gardens, Hanwell W7 2JQ

- 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 and Mrs Adam and Jennifer Smith against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 202001HH, dated 23 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is the 'Demolition of existing rear extension. Insertion of a new single storey extension to rear and side of main house connecting to studio and storage out-building in former, original garage'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a traditional end of terrace house which sits within a road of similar properties. The plot which the appeal dwelling sits within is much wider to the rear than the front and a store/home office sits along the northern side boundary, at an angle to the dwelling itself. The proposal seeks to demolish an existing rear extension and replace it with another which would link with this detached building.
 4. Given the angle at which the detached building sits, the proposed extension would wrap around the house in order to connect to it, infilling the space between them. When considered alongside the detached building, the proposed addition would be very large and it would appear cumbersome. It would not respond well to the scale, form and proportions of the host dwelling.
 5. Bearing in mind the position of the existing detached building and the neighbouring garage, it is accepted that only a very small section of the proposed extension would be visible from the public domain. Nevertheless, the footprint and arrangement of the enlarged dwelling would be out of keeping with the prevailing pattern and layout of the traditional dwellings within Croft
-

Gardens. 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 collectively promote high quality design that respects and strengthens its context.

Other considerations

6. It is accepted that the proposed extension would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, but this is a neutral factor in the overall planning balance. The Appellants explain that the proposal would see the replacement of a poorly insulated existing rear extension and would create additional room for a growing family. These factors are not disputed, but no evidence has been advanced to persuade me that a more sympathetically designed extension could not deliver similar benefits.
7. The Appellants refer generally to other extensions within the locality. However, none of those evident at my visit were directly comparable to the proposal before me in terms of their overall scale and form. I have considered the scheme on its individual merits in any event.
8. The Appellants also assert that the proposed extension aligns closely with the dimensions of single storey extensions which are allowed under the permitted development regime. Whilst this may be so in terms of building height, the permitted development regime does not allow for extensions which 'wrap around' and connect to a detached building in the manner proposed. I therefore attached very limited weight to this argument.

Overall Conclusion

9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and local area. The arguments advanced by the Appellants do not outweigh this harm and associated policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR