



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2022

by B Davies MSc FGS CGeol

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 MARCH 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/22/3291246

293 Greenford Avenue, Hanwell, London W7 1AD

- 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 Peter Quarm against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 216175HH, dated 18 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The description of the development in the banner above is that used by the Council and the appellant at appeal. It more clearly describes the development than that on the original application form.

Main issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - the character and appearance of the conservation area, and
 - the character and appearance of the host house.

Reasons

Conservation area

4. The appeal site is in the Cuckoo Estate Conservation Area (CA). I have not been provided with a copy of the appraisal for the CA. However, I observed that it was a planned estate built between the wars and that the original layout and architecture have largely been retained. Neat, widely spaced terraces of houses are arranged around green spaces and garden areas, introducing light and resulting in a sense of openness. The management plan¹ identifies the harm that could be caused to the CA by unsympathetic, poorly designed extensions and alterations.
5. The appeal site is on the end of a terrace at the edge of the estate facing outwards towards busy Greenford Avenue. It is adjacent to an open, green corridor lined with hedges and mature trees that provides pedestrian access

¹ Cuckoo Estate Conservation Area Management Plan (March 2007)

and important views from the wider area into the heart of the estate. The green corridor is an important entrance to the CA because it displays and establishes its character from a prominent viewpoint on Greenford Avenue. The proposed extension would be visible from the public pathways through the green area and from Greenford Avenue.

6. The host house frames this entrance with the matching house on the other side of the green corridor, and in this makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA. The original symmetry with the house on the other side of the green has already been eroded through construction of 2 side extensions on this side of the host house². Adding further bulk on the first floor would further diminish the designed symmetry causing harm to the character and appearance of the CA in a prominent location.
7. The green corridor is lined by identical terraced houses running perpendicular to Greenford Avenue. These have been arranged to produce large gaps between the terraces on each corner of the green. The gaps provide glimpses of the greenery in the gardens beyond and contribute to the openness that is an important, positive characteristic of the estate. At the appeal site this gap has been partly filled by the existing extensions and a single storey extension attached to the adjacent, perpendicular house. Further erosion of this gap would be caused by the proposal resulting in harmful further loss of the characteristic symmetry and openness.
8. I have no reason to doubt that 2 storey extensions are more prevalent than single storey extensions locally. However, the unusual location of this property means that in this case the additional bulk would be harmful to the character and appearance of the CA.
9. I conclude that the proposal fails to protect or conserve the CA. It therefore does not meet the requirements of Policy 7C of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (December 2013) (DPD) and Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021), which state that heritage assets must be protected, conserved and, where appropriate, enhanced.

Character and appearance of the host house

10. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document for Residential Extensions (2004) (SPD4) states that extensions should be no more than half the width of the original house. It is not in dispute that the original house was 5.8 m wide and that the cumulative extensions would add 5.3 m, which is significantly in exceedance of this guideline. However, the proposal is to add a modestly sized second floor to the existing single storey extension. Given that the overall width of the extensions has previously been established and the addition is modest I give negligible weight to the conflict with SPD4.
11. The terrace is on a slope and is long enough to make the originally planned symmetry difficult to appreciate from the public domain. The extended width of the house has already been permitted and the proposal represents a modest change upwards. In this context, I do not consider that the additional bulk would be noticeably harmful to the balance of the host house in the context of the terraced structure.

² P/2008/2404 (September 2008) and 172265HH (June 2017)

12. The roof pitch of the existing single storey extension is out of keeping with the host property. My attention has been drawn to the support provided for consistent roof pitches in SPD4. Although it is not necessary to put a second storey on to achieve this, this development would result in the roofs being better aligned and this would be a benefit, albeit of minor weight.
13. I acknowledge that the host terrace is on a slope and that the proposed roof profile would reflect the underlying topography. I consider this to be a matter of neutral weight.
14. I have not identified that there would be harm to the character and appearance of the host house from the development. There is therefore no conflict in this respect with Policies 7.4 of the DPD or D1 and D4 of the London Plan, which together require that housing is of appropriate scale, design and layout.

Conclusion

15. I have not identified harm to the character and appearance of the host house and there would be minor benefit from aligning the roof slope with the existing structure.
16. However, the character and appearance of the Cuckoo Estate CA would not be preserved. In coming to this conclusion, I have considered the duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) requires that if any harm is less than substantial, which this would be, then the harm should be weighed against the public benefits. There would be a very minor public benefit from realignment of the roof, but this would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm to the CA, which is a matter of great weight.
17. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the local development plan when read as a whole. There are no other considerations that would lead me to determine other than in accordance with this and the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

B Davies

INSPECTOR