



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: 26 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/21/3277602

5 Oakfield Gardens, Greenford UB6 8SD

- 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 Ashraf Mohammad Ali against the decision of London Borough of Ealing.
- The application Ref 204460FUL, dated 30 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 January 2021.
- The development proposed is the conversion of existing house into 2 self-contained residential units; single storey front porch extension; single storey side/rear (wrap around) extension, following demolition of existing garage and conservatory; alteration of roof from hip to gable end and roof extension to rear (main) roof slope; part rear roof extension to rear outrigger roof slope and installation of two roof lights to front roof slope.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the Council's description of development as this more accurately describes the development proposed.
3. Since determination of the planning application, the 2016 iteration of the London Plan has been superseded. Policies 3.5, 7.4, 7.6 of the 2016 plan, which were cited in the Council's reasons for refusal, have now broadly been replaced by Policies D3, D4 and D6 of the 2021 version¹. Both parties have had the opportunity to comment on the changes. I have therefore determined this appeal with regard to the most up to date development plan.

Main Issues

4. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the living conditions of the future occupiers of the development and the occupiers of no. 7 Oakfield Gardens; and
 - the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

Living Conditions

5. The proposed development would incorporate a substantial rear extension, which would project out by approximately 4 metres beyond the rear boundary

¹ The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, March 2021 (The London Plan)

to no. 7. Given the proximity of the extension's flank wall to the shared boundary, the extension would dominate a large proportion of this shared boundary, thereby creating a significant sense of enclosure within the garden to no. 7. This sense of enclosure would significantly detract from the mutual openness currently experienced in the gardens to these properties (owing to their broadly common rear building line), which would harm the living conditions of its occupiers.

6. The additional flat that is proposed within the new side/rear wrap around extension would have an internal floorspace of approximately 37sqm. The proposed bedroom would have an internal floor area of approximately 11.5sqm, therefore meeting the size requirements for a double room. Notwithstanding any potential for the property to be occupied on a dual occupancy basis, the property would even fall short of the minimum space requirement for a one bedroom, one person dwelling (which is 39sqm). Given this is a bare minimum requirement, the development would fail to provide adequate living space for its future occupiers.
7. For these reasons, the development would harm the living conditions of its future occupiers, as well as those of the occupiers of no. 7. The development would therefore conflict with Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021 and the Technical Housing Standards, which require new residential development to adhere to minimum space standards. The development would also conflict with Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021, which seek to ensure the amenity of neighbouring residents is adequately protected as part of any new development. Similarly, the proposal would conflict with Policies 7B and LV7.4 of the Council's Development Management DPD (adopted 2013) (DPD), SPD4 (Residential Extensions) and the Mayor of London's Housing SPG (2016), all of which seek to safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Character and Appearance

8. The appeal property comprises a semi-detached bungalow with a hipped roof, with a separate detached garage running along the northern side of the property. It is situated along a residential road which has a tight grain of development, where most neighbouring properties are similar in terms of size and design.
9. The proposed development would incorporate a side and rear wrap around extension, which would extend the footprint of the dwelling by approximately 75sqm. Given the property's original footprint is approximately 54sqm, in themselves, the combined area of the extensions would far exceed the size of the original dwelling. As a result, the extension would fail to appear sufficiently subordinate or subservient to the original dwelling, and instead would appear bulky, excessive and dominant, harming the character of both the host property and the wider street scene.
10. At the rear, the extension would increase the depth of the dwelling by approximately 6.4 metres. Paragraph 5 of SPD4 (Residential Extensions) is explicit that rear extensions shouldn't increase the depth of a property by more than 3m, unless the house is detached or where there is a large separation distance with the closest neighbouring property. Neither of these exceptions would be applicable in this instance. As a result, the depth of the rear extension would more than double the maximum limit usually permitted, and would therefore dominate the rear of the property. This would significantly

detract from the openness currently experienced at the rear of these properties, which in turn would detract from the prevailing pattern of development in the area.

11. Whilst the development would introduce an additional entrance to the front of the property, there are a number of other dwellings along the road which incorporate similar frontages. As such, this feature would not be unique within the street scene. I am therefore satisfied that this element of the proposal would not cause undue harm to the character of the road. However, this is a neutral factor, and would not outweigh the harm arising from the increased bulk of the appeal property.
12. For these reasons, the development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The development would therefore conflict with Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021, Policies 7.4 and LV7.4 of the Council's DPD, SPD4 (Residential Extensions) and the Mayor of London's Housing SPD, all of which seek to ensure new development responds properly to local character in terms of proportion, scale and bulk.

Other Matters

13. Whilst I acknowledge that the side extension would achieve a degree of subservience to the host property owing to the proposed step back and slight lower ridge height, these factors in themselves would not overcome the harm arising from the excessive size of the proposed extensions when considered in the context of the current footprint.
14. In terms of the roof extension, the development would change the roof from a hipped roof to a gable ended roof. Given that the roof to no. 7 has incorporated a similar design, I am satisfied that this element of the proposal would integrate properly with the street scene. However, once again this is a neutral factor and would not outweigh the other harm arising from the development as identified above.

Conclusion

15. 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