



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2021

by Rebecca McAndrew BA Hons, PG Dip Urban Design, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/20/3259008
84 Creffield Road, Acton W3 9PX

- 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 Dhali Property Services against the decision of Ealing Council.
 - The application Ref 190224FUL, dated 17 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a double storey rear extension and loft extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The London Plan (2021) has been published since the appeal was made. I shall consider the appeal accordingly. In doing so I am satisfied that no injustice will be caused since the relevant policies which seek to deliver good design are essentially the same as in the previous plan.

Main Issue

3. The main issues are;
 - i) The effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; and
 - ii) The effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, Nos 82 and 86, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal building is a traditional semi-detached property, with a flat on each of its three floors. The appeal proposal seeks to demolish an existing ground floor extension and to construct a two-storey full width rear extension, as well as a rear roof extension with dormer. The SPD4 Ealing Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2004) (ERESPD) states 'two-storey rear extensions should appear subordinate to the original house and, if possible, should be set back from boundaries shared with neighbouring properties to minimise the potential impact' (Section 5). Section 6 of this SPD warns against mansard roof extensions which change the slope of the roof and advises

'Dormer windows should be designed so they do not appear unduly obtrusive or dominant. They should respect the character of the original dwelling and should not take up the entire area of a roof slope'.

5. The appeal scheme would include a substantial two storey extension which, due to its width and excessive depth, would be overly dominant and subsume the existing rear elevation of the property. The proposed mansard roof extension would unacceptably alter the slope of the roof, with a bulky box dormer spanning almost the full width of this extension: This roof extension would be an unduly obtrusive addition to the roofscape. Culmulative, the appeal proposals would be overbearing and at odds with the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding dwellings.
6. In view of the above, the appeal scheme would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Consequently, the scheme would be contrary to Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021), Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan (2013) (EDMDP) and the ERESPD which, taken together, seek to secure high quality design which responds to local character.

Living Conditions

7. The excessive depth and mass of the proposed two-storey extension, along with its position on the boundary with adjoining property No 82, would create an unacceptable sense of enclosure to this neighbouring dwelling. I note that space would be retained between the proposed extension and adjacent property, No 86. However, given the depth of this structure in comparison to the position of the rear elevation of the neighbouring property, the appeal proposals would also create an unacceptable sense of enclosure to the dwelling. On this basis, the proposed extension would unduly harm the outlook of the neighbouring properties on both sides of the appeal site.
8. In view of the above, the appeal proposal would significantly harm the living conditions of the residents of neighbouring properties. The scheme would therefore be contrary to Policy 7B of the EDMDP and the ERESPD, which seek to protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Other Matters

9. I have considered matters the appellant raises in support of the appeal proposals, including the desire to increase the size of the flats for existing residents and the fact that no neighbour objections have been received. However, neither of these matters outweigh the harm that I have described.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR