



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 May 2022

by J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/21/3288396

95 Greenford Road, Greenford UB6 9BB

- 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 Steven Galvin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 214760FUL, dated 12 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of an additional storey to provide 2 studio flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. In its Officer Report, the Council highlights some inaccuracies in the submitted plans with regard to the representation of windows, doors and a rooflight to the existing building. However, I am satisfied having inspected the site that the plans are sufficiently clear to inform my assessment of the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a two-storey detached building on the corner of Stanhope Road and Greenford Road which is occupied as 4 flats. The building is narrower than the runs of two-storey terraced dwellings which generally characterise the closest part of Greenford Road to the north of the site. Nevertheless, the height, hipped roof form, rendered external finish and pattern of fenestration to the building are all broadly consistent with these neighbours so that its overall appearance is similar, and it sits comfortably as part of the group.
5. The proposed additional storey would increase the height of the appeal building above the neighbouring two-storey dwellings on Greenford Road and Stanhope Road. However, there are 2 nearby bungalows which sit adjacent to two-storey dwellings on Greenford Road to the south of the Stanhope Road junction. I also observed taller buildings of much larger overall scale at 57 Greenford Road and at Cardinal Wiseman Catholic School, and large buildings at Greenford Depot in the wider area. These buildings are not in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. Nevertheless, they are visible from it, and some variation in the height and overall scale of development is therefore already a feature of this part of Greenford Road. In this context, I do not find that the greater height of the

appeal building relative to its neighbours would in itself be significantly out of keeping or jarring within the street scene.

6. Be that as it may, the part-gable, part-hipped design of the roof would be an unusual and incongruous feature in the area. The relatively closely set arrangement of the 5 dormers to the front roofslope would also cause the roof to appear cluttered, and would stand out against the mostly unaltered hipped roof forms that are characteristic to this part of Greenford Road. The unsympathetic nature of the development would be heightened by the tile-hanging to the upper part of the building which would contrast with the typical brick and render wall finishes of development in the vicinity of the site. In addition, the window proposed to the front of the building to serve the stairs would sit awkwardly between the first and second-floor level glazing, and in my view would be a jarring addition that would detract from the character and appearance of the building. In combination, these factors would result in a discordant development that I find would relate poorly to its surroundings.
7. Moreover, the appeal building is already somewhat conspicuous given its position on a prominent corner and sitting forward of its neighbours on both Greenford Road and Stanhope Road. This would be exacerbated by the height and incongruous appearance of the development, and I find that the proposal would result in a highly prominent and intrusive feature in the street scene.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, and it would conflict with Policies 7B and 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document 2013 and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021 (LP). Together and amongst other things, these policies broadly seek good design, and development that responds positively to local distinctiveness and that complements and has a positive visual impact on its surroundings. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) insofar as it requires well-designed places and development that is sympathetic to local character and that adds to the overall quality of the area.

Other Matters

9. I acknowledge clear objectives within the Framework and LP seeking to significantly boost the supply of housing and to make effective use of previously developed land. Even so, the contribution that the development would make to the supply of housing would be limited by its small scale, and the modest benefits of the proposal would not in my view be sufficient to outweigh the significant harm that it would cause to the character and appearance of the area and the resulting conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would conflict with the development plan when it is read as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that a decision contrary to the development plan should be reached. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Bowyer

INSPECTOR