
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2022

by Martin Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/21/3277003

104 Corringway, Ealing, 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 Dr Seyed Tabatabaei against the decision of London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 211827HH, dated 9 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as "Changes to front driveway and associated landscaping".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, bearing in mind the sites location within the Hangar Hill (Haymills) Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The site lies within the Hangar Hill (Haymills) Estate Conservation Area (the CA). The significance of this area lies, in part, in the layout of development within, which forms a neat semi-circle comprising three roads, one of which is Corringway, along which the appeal site is located. The CA Character Appraisal identifies that the original garden frontage to most houses in the estate consisted of low brick wall and a hedge, the existing examples of this arrangement positively contribute to the significance of the CA today.
4. The CA Character Appraisal further identifies that "The loss of front garden trees and fences together with loss of garden walls constitute a threat to the area's character. However, large portions of original boundary walls and fences have been demolished and replaced inappropriately. This has resulted in a significant loss in definition of the streetscape and a loss of the original spatial hierarchy between public and private spaces within the CA."
5. The appeal scheme proposes the erection of metal fencing above the existing low boundary wall that currently runs along the footway. While it would rise to one metre in height, this would more than double the existing height of the front boundary wall. It would also stretch the entire length of the site's frontage with the road.

6. As a consequence, the proposed fencing would appear as an intrusive and discordant feature within the street and would diminish the openness of the front garden and the diminutive height of the existing low wall.
7. While I note that there are other examples of garden frontages in the area that have been enclosed, they are not in the majority and do not reflect the predominantly open frontages that can be seen. Thus, such examples do not persuade me that the appeal scheme is an acceptable form of development at this location.
8. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, including that of the conservation area, thereby harming its significance as a designated heritage asset. Thus, the scheme conflicts with policies 7.4, 7B and 7C of the Ealing Development Management – Development Plan Document (adopted 2013), as well as policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (adopted 2021). Together, and amongst other things, they seek to ensure that development complements street sequence, that external treatments complement their context, that development within conservation areas retains characteristic features, that development is of a high design quality and development affecting heritage assets conserve their significance.
9. The scheme would also conflict with the design and heritage protection aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), as well as the aims of the Hanger Hill (Haymills) Estate Conservation Area Management Plan and Appraisal (2008). The Council’s decision notice also refers to policy 7A, however this does not appear to be directly relevant to the appeal scheme.
10. In causing harm and failing to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area, I find that the scheme would result in less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset. As required by paragraph 202 of the Framework, I have had regard to any public benefits of the proposed development. However, any such benefit is not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR