



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2021 by M Long

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/21/3275331

104 Corringway, Ealing, London W5 3HA

- 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 Seyed Tabatabaei against the decision of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 211826HH, dated 9 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing garage. Double storey side and rear extension, part single storey rear extension, loft conversion and porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. On 20 July 2021 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I have had regard to this as a material consideration however, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The issues most relevant to this appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hanger Hill (Haymills) Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is located in the Hanger Hill (Haymills) Estate Conservation Area, an early-twentieth century built suburban area which predominantly derives its significance from its spacious character and large, detached dwellings that vary in architectural design. The appeal site is a two-storey detached dwelling with a staggered front elevation, hipped roof and separate side garage that is constructed close to the shared boundary with No 102.

This neighbouring property to the south has a form which broadly mirrors that of the appeal dwelling and it similarly retains a side garage close to the shared boundary. The mirrored built form is commonly found in the Conservation Area and has established a distinctive spatial relationship within the Corringway streetscene. The space above the two single storey garages maintains visual separation between the two properties.

6. The Council has stated that the proposed rear dormer and rear single storey extension would be acceptable when considered in isolation. Although these elements of the scheme cannot be separated, the following recommendation will focus on the effects of the other aspects of the appeal scheme.
7. The proposed scheme includes the demolition of the existing garage and the construction of a two-storey side and rear extension. The extension would be set back from the front elevation and its hipped roof would be set down from the existing ridge line by a short distance. The first floor would also be set in from the southern boundary by a short distance leaving a single storey element with a mono-pitched roof. The proposal also includes a front porch extension that would be in line with the projecting element of the front elevation.
8. The substantial size and scale of the proposed side and rear extension would appear overly dominant within the Corringway streetscene and the limited set down of the proposed roof from the existing ridge line would relate unsympathetically to the host dwelling. The extension would be set back from the front elevation by a short distance, however this would not adequately minimise the harm that would arise from its dominant size.
9. The demolition of the existing garage and its replacement with a significantly larger extension would detract from the mirrored built form established between the appeal property and No 102. The extension's positioning close to the shared boundary and proposed additional bulk at first floor level would encroach upon the visual separation between these two properties. While the first floor would be set in by a short distance, this would not sufficiently mitigate the harmful erosion of the spatial relationship between the neighbouring dwellings within the Corringway streetscene.
10. The forward projection of the proposed porch extension would disrupt the staggered front elevation design which is characteristic to the host dwelling. While the appellant has stated that the associated uses of the porch would result in improvements to living conditions, these private benefits would not outweigh the harm identified against the character of the host dwelling.
11. Within the Design and Access Statement, the appellant has identified a number of development schemes relating to surrounding properties, including Nos 50, 99, 106, 108 and 140 Corringway. While the full details of these schemes are not before me, it appears that there are a number of discernible differences in the scale and overall design of these developments and the appeal scheme. Upon my visit to the site, I observed a number of further examples of large side and porch extensions that were visible within the streetscene, including Nos 55 and 116 Corringway and 36 Ashbourne Road. However, these instances were not so numerous that they formed a significant part of the character of the Conservation Area. Therefore, the appeal scheme would not preserve the character or appearance of the area. In any event, each appeal must be determined on its individual planning merits and circumstances.

12. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. As the proposed development would only be seen from a limited area, the development's harm to the wider Hanger Hill (Haymills) Estate Conservation Area, as a designated heritage asset, would be less than substantial. In such circumstances, paragraph 202 of the Framework indicates that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. However, no substantive public benefits have been put forward to outweigh this harm and, in line with the Framework, great weight has been given to the conservation of heritage assets.
13. The Hanger Hill (Haymills) Estate Conservation Area Management Plan identifies out-of-scale extensions and the loss of original garage buildings as threats to the spatial relationship between buildings in the Conservation Area. For the above reasons, the proposal would conflict with the aims of this document.
14. Given the above, the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hanger Hill (Haymills) Estate Conservation Area. The private benefits of the scheme in terms of improved living space for the appellant would not outweigh this. The proposal would be contrary to the Ealing Development Management: Development Plan Document, adopted December 2013. It would conflict with Policy 7.4 which seeks to ensure development complements the scale of existing built areas and Policy 7B which seeks to ensure new development has a positive visual impact. It would also be contrary to Policy 7C which seeks to ensure development within conservation areas retains and enhances characteristic features. There would be further conflict with The London Plan, adopted March 2021, specifically Policy HC1 which seeks to ensure development affecting heritage assets conserves their significance. Although the Council mention conflict with Policy D4 within their reasons for refusal, this Policy is strategic in nature and focuses on the design process and scrutiny, it does not appear to be directly relevant to the modest nature of the appeal scheme.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. The proposed development would not accord with the development plan when considered as a whole. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Long

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR