
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 August 2021

by C Osgathorp BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/21/3269365

40 Cayton Road, Greenford UB6 8BJ

- 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 Sunil Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 204333HH, dated 23 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of garage for the proposal of a two storey side extension and the enlargement to existing single storey extension to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for demolition of garage for the proposal of a two storey side extension and the enlargement to existing single storey extension to the rear at 40 Cayton Road, Greenford UB6 8BJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 204333HH, dated 23 October 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 170 P E01; 170 P E02; 170 P E03; 170 P E04; 170 P E05; 170 P P01; 170 P P02; 170 P P03; 170 P P04; and 170 P P05.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Sunil Patel against the Council of the London Borough of Ealing. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street scene and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The area predominantly consists of semi-detached dwellings of similar scale and appearance that are sited on a consistent building line behind modest front gardens. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling which is located at the end of Cayton Road adjacent to Northolt Rugby Club. It has an existing single storey attached garage on the northern side of the property and a single storey rear extension. The main roof of the dwelling is hipped, and the front elevation features a small hipped projection.
5. The appeal scheme proposes the demolition of the existing side garage and the erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. The two storey extension would adjoin the side boundary and would be set back around 300mm from the front wall of the dwelling.
6. The Council's Interim Guidance Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 4 (SPD4) sets out that the front wall of a side extension should be set back at least one metre from the front wall of the main house at first floor and above, and the roof ridge line of an extension should be set below the ridgeline of the main dwelling by at least 0.5m. It indicates that this is to ensure that the extension would appear subordinate to the original house. Nevertheless, SPD4 is guidance and does not have the same force as adopted development plan policies. The acceptability of a proposal will depend on the individual circumstances of the case.
7. The proposed extension would be set back from the front wall of the dwelling and set down from the ridge line of the main roof, however this would be to a lesser extent than the guidance in SPD4. Nevertheless, the proposed extension would be modest in width and the overall composition would appear proportionate and secondary to the existing dwelling. The roof of the proposed extension would respect the pitch and hipped form of the main roof, which would limit the bulk of the extension. The extension would therefore integrate satisfactorily with the scale and form of the semi-detached property, and it would not un-balance the semi-detached pair. Furthermore, the appeal site is located at the end of Cayton Road, which would restrict views and prominence of the proposal in the street scene.
8. Whilst the proposed extension would adjoin the side boundary, the large separation from neighbouring buildings, as a result of the location of the appeal site at the end of Cayton Road, would ensure that the proposal would not cause a terracing effect in the street scene. I have had regard to the appellant's reference to existing two storey extensions in the locality and other decisions made by the Council. However, whilst this is a material planning consideration, it would not alter my findings for this appeal which I have determined on its own merits.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would maintain the character and appearance of the street scene and the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore accord with Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document Adopted December 2013 and Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021. Amongst other things, these policies seek high quality design and to ensure that new development complements the building and local context. The proposal would also accord with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, which, among other matters, states that decisions should ensure that developments are

visually attractive as a result of good architecture and are sympathetic to local character. Whilst the proposal would conflict with some aspects of the guidance in SPD4, it would accord with its underlying objectives to ensure that side extensions appear subordinate to the original dwelling.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. In order to maintain the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area, I have also imposed a condition requiring the external surfaces of the development to be finished in materials to match those used in the existing building.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Osgathorp

INSPECTOR