

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/22/3292949

97 Pleasant Way, Wembley HA0 1DQ

- 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 Artur Ros against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 215729HH, dated 20 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is the 'conversion of a garage into a habitable room including associated external alteration involving the insertion of a window in lieu of the garage door opening; first floor side extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of the development from the Council's Decision Notice rather than the Application Form as it more accurately reflects the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a semi-detached dwelling which sits on the corner of Pleasant Way and Manor Farm Road. It is located within an area which is home to a range of dwelling types along with some commercial development.
 5. The appeal dwelling has been the subject of a part two storey and part single storey extension to the side which is set back slightly from the main front elevation. The two storey element is set down from the main ridge and is finished with a gable whilst the single storey element has a part hipped and part crown roof.
 6. The proposal seeks to convert the garage to habitable space and add a first floor above it. The Council raises no concerns in relation to the conversion of the garage itself and I see no reason to disagree.
-

7. The Council does, however, have concerns about the proposed first floor addition. This would be built directly above the garage addition, set back slightly from the main front elevation of the host dwelling in the same manner as the existing two storey extension. It would continue the eaves and ridge of the existing two storey side extension and it would finish with a hipped roof.
8. The proposed first floor addition, when considered alongside the existing two storey extension, would be noticeably wider than the original dwelling. As a result, it would be seen as part of an overly large and disproportionate addition and the effect would further imbalance this pair of semi-detached dwellings, even accounting for the reinstatement of the hipped roof form. Furthermore, when seen from the west, the proposed first floor extension would breach the established building line of the houses within Pleasant Way which run parallel to the highway. From here, it would be seen as an overly prominent and jarring addition to the street scene.
9. For the above reasons, I find that the proposed first floor addition would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits. In this regard, it conflicts with saved policy 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document.
10. The Appellant asserts that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties in any way. Whilst this is not disputed, it is a neutral factor in the overall planning balance. The Appellant also argues that the proposal amounts to sustainable development. However, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) explains that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. As I have explained why the proposal does not exhibit good design, it cannot amount to sustainable development in the widest sense of the definition provided by the NPPF.
11. The Appellant also refers to a range of extensions which are present within the local area. However, from what I can deduce, only the extension at No. 18 Pleasant Way appears to have a similar relationship with adjacent dwellings. Whilst I do not know the precise planning circumstances behind this and the other examples highlighted, this particular extension only compounds my concerns about the proposal before me, which I have considered on its individual merits in any event.
12. Finally, the Appellant advances that the extension is required to meet the specific needs of his son. Whilst I sympathise with this position, nothing I have seen or read persuades me that additional accommodation could not be provided in a more visually acceptable manner.

Overall Conclusion

13. I conclude that the proposed first floor extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits, contrary to the development plan policy outlined above. The arguments advanced by the Appellant do not outweigh this harm and policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR