



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2021

by Jonathon Parsons MSc BSc(Hons) DipTP Cert(Urb) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/20/3260936

4 Allison Road, Acton W3 6JE

- 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 Gurney (Ealing Asset Management Limited) against the decision of Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 201640FUL, dated 24 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is part two-storey, part single-storey ground floor rear extension; internal reconfiguration from 3 flats to 4 flats - with the additional residential unit accommodated in the ground floor; refuse and cycle storage provision.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The London Plan (LP) 2021 was adopted on 2 March and supersedes the London Plan 2016 (with Consolidated Alterations since 2011). Both main parties were consulted over this plan change and LP Policy D6 is now relevant now instead of the previous LP policies. There is a directly adjacent neighbouring building variously referred to as 6 and 8 Allison Road. In this decision, it has been referred to as No 8 based on the submitted location plan.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The application comprises a two storey semi-detached building which contains three flats. The building has a single storey ground floor addition and a second floor flat-roofed dormer.
5. Many of the neighbouring buildings benefit from two-storey rear outrigger additions that give them a 'L'-shape. Buildings on this stretch of Allison Road between Brougham Road and Faraday Road have also been extended to the rear. For the other half of the semi-detached dwelling at 2 Allison Road, there is a rear ground floor extension flanking onto Brougham Road. At 12 and 16 Allison Road, additional rear extensions of varying size, scale and design have been added around their outriggers. As a result, the rear elevations vary in

extent and nature at all floor levels due to the mixture of extensions and original features.

6. However, the proposed ground floor extension would extend significantly beyond the rear of the host building and its two direct neighbours at Nos 2 and 8. In this regard, it would project approximately 5.4m beyond the rear outrigger at No 8. Due to its depth, such a rearward extension would be visually awkward when viewed from Brougham Road and from the backs of neighbouring residential buildings. The screening effect of a roadside verge tree on Brougham Road and a further tree within the garden of No 2 would be insufficient to filter views, especially in winter due to the deciduous nature of the vegetation. In any case, there would be no guarantee that the vegetation would remain. Over time, trees may be removed for any number of reasons, such as weather and accidental damage, and replacement planting inevitably takes time to establish.
7. The proposed first floor extension would project only a small amount beyond the rear outrigger at No 8. Part of the ground floor extension would be shorter in depth alongside the common boundary with No 2, not reaching significantly beyond the rear of the existing adjacent buildings. Both these elements of the proposal would not adversely affect the character or appearance of the building or area. However, taken together with the deeper ground floor extension element, they would increase the footprint of the existing building by approximately eighty percent. The rear garden area, a hard surfaced area, would also be considerably reduced. In their totality, the extensions would combine to adversely overwhelm the original building and would fail to be subordinate or in scale with the local built environment.
8. There has been a previous planning permission for rear ground and first floor extensions on the property. However, the proposal would increase the depth of the permitted rear ground floor extension by approximately 2.4m. This would result in a significant increase in size, considering the depth, width and height of the extension. The building at No 16 has extensive ground floor and first floor extensions but it is a corner property and has a return frontage relating to Faraday Road. Other extensions have been built along this section of Allison Road, but none extend as far back as the appeal proposal. Accordingly, there are significant differences between this proposal and these other extended buildings, and every proposal must be considered on its particular planning merits.
9. For all these reasons, the development would result in a significant over development of the site that would harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would conflict with Policies 1.1 and 1.2 of the Ealing Development (Core) Strategy (DS) 2012, Policies 7B and 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD) 2013 and Policy D6 of the LP.

Other matters

10. The proposal would make effective use of land in accordance with the policy of the National Planning Policy Framework and local planning policies. It would provide an additional unit of accommodation. The garden space that would serve the permitted one bedroom apartment is particularly large and unlikely to be used to its full potential. With this proposal, the garden space would be better utilised with a two bedroom family apartment to use the garden instead.

11. The single storey extension has a contemporary feel due to the asymmetrical alignment of its gable roof. It has been designed to minimise any living condition effects on the occupiers of neighbouring properties and the Council has raised no objections based on harm to neighbour's living conditions.
12. However, the net increase of one residential unit would be very small as a proportion of housing supply. The lack of harm to the living conditions of neighbours does not weigh in favour of the proposal. It is a prerequisite for the acceptability of any successful scheme that there is no harm to the living conditions of residents. The proposal would not be good design because the harm to the character and appearance of the area would be significant and permanent. Under the Framework, good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. For all these reasons, the adverse impacts of the proposal would outweigh the benefits.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area in conflict with DS, DPD and LP policies, and the development plan taken as a whole. For the reasons indicated, there are no material considerations to outweigh that finding. Therefore, for the reasons set out above, this appeal is dismissed.

Jonathon Parsons

INSPECTOR