



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2022

by James Blackwell LLB (Hons) PgDip

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/21/3284124

Rear of 1 Golden Manor, Hanwell, London, W7 3EE

- 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 Ms M.E Ambo against the decision of London Borough of Ealing.
- The application Ref 210042FUL, dated 27 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2021.
- The development proposed is the construction of a single storey detached dwelling house, including basement with access fronting on to Alwyne Road; provision of associated landscaping and amenity space, refuse and cycle storage.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The date of the application is not clear on the application form. I have therefore used the "application received" date on the Council's decision notice for the purposes of this decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Hanwell Village Green Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located along a suburban road within the Hanwell Village Green Conservation Area (CA). It comprises part of the rear garden of 1 Golden Manor, which is a residential dwelling occupying a corner plot at the junction of Golden Manor and Alwyne Road. There is a substantial area of public open space (Manor Court Green) opposite the appeal site, which gives the area a strong sense of openness, which contributes positively to its overriding character. The houses in the area are generally sited within spacious plots and benefit from large gardens, which further contribute to this sense of openness.
5. The Character Appraisal for the CA¹ sets out the defining features of the CA. Golden Manor is specifically noted for its "*well detailed detached or semi-detached family houses, set back from the street within a common building line*". It goes on to highlight the "*more formal layout*" of all four main streets within the southern part of the CA, which include both Golden Manor and Alwyne Road. These streets are distinguished for their "*common building line, creating space for modest front gardens*" which "*add greenery and relate to the*

¹ Hanwell Village Green Conservation Area Character Appraisal, March 2008

open spaces and trees in Manor Court Green". The Character Appraisal also highlights the "*substantial rear gardens and lavish trees*" which characterise this part of the CA, which help enhance its green and open setting. As intimated above, this analysis was consistent with my own observations of the area during my site visit.

6. The proposed development would introduce a single storey detached dwelling on the appeal site, fronting out on to Alwyne Road. It would be sited significantly forward of the established front building line of the other dwellings along this road, thereby disrupting the prevailing pattern of development. Whilst the property would be largely screened from view at street level by a tall timber fence, the pitched roof of the northern-most section of the property would sit taller than the fence, meaning the visual disruption caused by the breach of building line would still be readily experienced along Alwyne Road. In turn, this would undermine the more formal arrangement of dwellings which typify the road, thereby harming the character of the CA.
7. Whilst I acknowledge that the footprint of the proposed dwelling has been reduced since the last application relating to the appeal site (which was dismissed on appeal²), the dwelling would nonetheless still occupy a large proportion of the appeal site, leaving only modest amounts of garden space to serve the property. Irrespective of the fact that the garden would exceed the minimum levels of private amenity space required for a dwelling of the size proposed, its limited size would jar with the established pattern of development in the area, in which houses are typically separated from the road by modest front gardens, and also benefit from substantial gardens to their rear. Even though the proposed development is relatively low level, in the context of neighbouring properties, it would still appear cramped and "hemmed in". This would detract from the area's overriding sense of openness, which is a fundamental characteristic of the CA.
8. For these reasons, I consider that the proposed development would cause less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the CA. Set against this harm, the development would contribute a new dwelling to the Council's housing stock. The dwelling would have strong sustainability credentials, and would offer good access to transport links and corresponding local services. It would also help reinstate an untidy site, by clearing overgrown vegetation and replacing the existing poor quality front boundary fence. Although I attach moderate weight to these benefits, as per the Framework (2021), great weight must be attributed to any harm to a heritage asset, irrespective of whether such harm is "less than substantial" or otherwise. On this basis, the moderate weight attributed to these benefits would not outweigh the harm to the CA as identified above.
9. The development would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Hanwell Village Green Conservation Area. It would conflict with Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021), which promote high quality design which conserves the significance of the Council's heritage assets. It would also conflict with Policies of 1.1(h) and 2.10 of the Council's Development Strategy 2026 (adopted 2012) and Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Development Management DPD (2013), all of which seek to safeguard the Council's historic environment, by ensuring new development responds

² APP/A5270/W/20/3247448

properly to the local street sequence, building pattern and scale of neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

10. The submitted unilateral undertaking would secure a financial payment to facilitate removal of the existing vehicle crossover. It would also ensure future residents of the proposed development would be prevented from obtaining parking permits for the controlled parking zone. Whilst these obligations would help ensure acceptability of the scheme in terms of parking and highway safety, they would not overcome the identified harm to the character and appearance of the CA.
11. When considered in isolation, I consider that the proposal would achieve a high-quality design, which is sympathetic to the prevailing design character of the wider area. I am also satisfied that the development would not cause undue harm to neighbouring amenity in terms of outlook, privacy or daylight. Nonetheless, these are neutral factors, and again, would not overcome the identified harm arising from the development's failure to adhere to other key characteristics of the CA.
12. Although the appeal site has been severed from the plot known as 1 Golden Manor, it is nonetheless experienced within the street scene as part of this property. Its openness remains in-keeping with the prevailing character the CA, and therefore warrants appropriate protection.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal should be dismissed.

James Blackwell

INSPECTOR