

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2022

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/22/3290906

46 Holyoake Walk, Ealing W5 1QJ

- 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 M Mukund against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref 216144HH, dated 15 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'demolition of existing side garage, proposed new single storey side and rear extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Conservation Area within which it sits, along with its effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 48 Holyoake Walk with particular regard to outlook and access to natural light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal relates to a traditional 'Arts and Crafts' style end of terrace house which is located within a road of dwellings of a similar style. The architectural quality of the buildings within the road is recognised by its inclusion within the Brentham Garden Estate Conservation Area (CA).
 4. The proposal seeks to replace the single storey garage structure at the side of the dwelling with a single storey extension which would 'wrap around' the side and rear.
 5. The existing garage is a modest structure with a shallow pitched roof sitting behind a parapet. Although its external brickwork is not an exact match of the brickwork of the host dwelling, the garage is recessed and sits discreetly within the street scene.
-

6. The proposed extension would also be set back from the principal elevation of the host dwelling and it would be built in matching external materials with appropriate window detailing. However, the extension would be finished with a part hip and part crown roof. This arrangement would not respond well to the traditional gables which are fundamental elements of the original form of the host dwelling. This approach would conflict with the guidance contained within the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 4 titled '*Residential Extensions*' (SPD) which explains that the roof of a single storey extension should be in keeping with the roof of the original dwelling. As a result, the extension would appear as an awkward and unsympathetic addition, which would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
7. As explained, the proposed extension would be recessed from the main front elevation of the host dwelling. Nevertheless, sections of the crown roof would be clearly visible from certain vantage points within the street scene, given the space between the main body of the host dwelling and the neighbouring dwelling to the south-west, No. 44 Holyoake Walk. This visual harm would detract from an otherwise well ordered street scene and therefore the proposal would fail to preserve the overall character and appearance of the CA.
8. 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.
9. 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.

Living conditions

10. The proposed extension would project some 3 metres from the outrigger at the rear of the host dwelling, and 3 metres from the attached outrigger of the neighbouring house, No. 48 Holyoake Walk, running directly along the shared boundary. To my mind, this is not an excessive level of rearward projection and I am mindful that it accords with the guidance of the SPD and it also normally falls within the tolerances of 'permitted development'.
11. For this reason, and bearing in mind that the roof of the proposed extension would fall away from the boundary with No. 48, I am satisfied that the proposed extension would not be unduly overbearing. Consequently, it would not unacceptably harm the outlook from the nearest room at the rear of No. 48 or from the nearest part of its rear garden. Nor would the proposed extension result in an unacceptable reduction in the levels of natural light available to this property.

Other considerations

12. The Appellant asserts that a planning application for a similar proposal was approved in 2005. Nevertheless, there is no suggestion that this earlier planning permission remains capable of being implemented and I have considered the proposal before me on its merits.
13. The Appellant also explains that the additional accommodation is required to meet his family's needs, including a requirement to work from home. However, nothing I have seen or read persuades me that additional space could not be provided in a more visually acceptable manner; or indeed that a more suitably designed extension could not also improve the overall thermal and energy efficiency of the property.

Overall Conclusions

14. I conclude that although the proposed extension would not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 48 Holyoake Walk, it would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the CA within which it sits. In such terms, the proposal conflicts with policies D3, D4, D6 and HC1 of The London Plan, policies 7B, 7C and 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document and the SPD.
15. The arguments advanced by the Appellant do not outweigh this harm and policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR