The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2022

**by David Fitzsimon MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 29 April 2022**

**Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/22/3291407**
**51 Lynwood Road, Ealing W5 1JQ**

- 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 Yan Lu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
- The application Ref 216254HH, dated 25 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2021.
- The development proposed is a 'two storey side extension & rooflights on front/side/rear slope & minor alterations.

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Conservation Area within which it sits.

## Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a substantial semi-detached dwelling which sits within a row of similar properties and is located on the corner of Lynwood Road and Sandall Road. Both the appeal dwelling and the dwelling on the opposite side of the junction are set well back from the highway and this makes a noticeable and positive contribution to the street scene and the overall character and appearance of the Brunswick Conservation Area (CA).

4. The ridge of the proposed two storey extension would be set down slightly from the main ridge of the host dwelling and its eaves would follow the existing eaves. The extension would also be set back 1 metre from the principal elevation and the external finishing materials and fenestration arrangement would be an appropriate match.

5. To my mind, the introduction of a two storey side extension will inevitably have some impact on the overall symmetry of a pair of semi-detached dwellings. However, in this case, I consider that the width of the proposed extension, at about 65% of the width of the host dwelling, would be excessive. Its consequent scale and massing would dilute the prominence of the double gable

which is an important design feature that dominates the principal elevation of this pair of semi-detached properties, thereby harmfully imbalancing them.

6. In addition, the overall width of the proposed extension would result in built development coming much closer to the highway of Sandall Road. The effect would harmfully reduce the current sense of openness and spaciousness at the junction, which as explained, makes a noticeable and positive contribution to this street scene and the overall character and appearance of the CA. To this end, I note that the Brunswick Conservation Area Management Plan (BCAMP) identifies bulky side extensions to be one of the main threats to the overall character and appearance of the CA.

7. The harm to the heritage asset would be 'less than substantial' as directed by the Planning Practice Guidance, but I attach considerable importance and weight to the statutory duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 that special attention should be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.

8. The National Planning Policy Framework explains that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. It goes on to say that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

*Other matters*

9. The Appellant does not suggest that the proposal would generate any public benefits. The Appellant asserts that the extension would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings in any way. This is not dispute but it is a neutral factor in the overall planning balance.

10. The Appellant refers to several other extensions within the local area, including those at 40/41 Clarendon Road. Whilst I accept that at least some of the extensions highlighted sit close to the roadside, I have considered the appeal proposal on its individual merits, taking into account the specific design of the host dwelling and the setting at the junction at which it sits.

**Overall Conclusions**

11. I conclude that the proposed two storey extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and it would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA within which it sits. In such terms, it conflicts with policies D1, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan, policy 1.1 of the adopted Ealing Core Strategy, policies 7.4, 7B and 7C of the adopted Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document and the BCAMP. Collectively, these policies promote high quality design which complements its surroundings and seek to protect heritage assets. The arguments advanced by the Appellant do not outweigh this harm and policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed.

*David Fitzsimon* INSPECTOR