



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 September 2022

by Nichola Robinson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/22/3296590

37 The Ridings, London W5 3BT

- 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 R Walia against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 216599HH, dated 15 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of first floor side and single storey rear extension to dwellinghouse and new crossover.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the Hanger Hill (Haymills) Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. 37 The Ridings is a large, detached property with a parking area and garden to the front. The property is located on a prominent corner plot at the junction of The Ridings and Chatsworth Rise within a street scene of similarly large dwellings set within spacious plots. The appeal property has a distinctive two storey bay window with chimney to the side elevation, which is visible from the street scene. This mirrors a matching feature at 35 The Ridings. Dwellings within The Ridings are set back from the highway. This, and planting within the street and in front and side gardens, contributes to a sense of space and openness in the area.
4. The site is located in the Hanger Hill (Haymills) Estate Conservation Area (CA), which covers a suburban residential area to the east of Hanger Hill Wood. Dwellings in the CA were constructed during the inter-war and post second world war period and the arrangement of roads follows a crescent shape which relates to the sloping nature of the area. The CA comprises large detached and semi-detached dwellings of a mixture of architectural styles set within spacious plots. The Hanger Hill (Haymills) Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2008) (CACA) identifies 4 main house types within the estate. The appeal property, with its tiled, hipped roof, projecting central porch and two storey bay windows appears to be a characteristic Neo-Georgian property. The scale and layout of dwellings and the quality and variety of architectural styles make a positive contribution to the suburban character and appearance of the CA and appear to

- contribute to its significance. The architectural quality of the appeal property makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.
5. The proposed side extension would not result in a terracing effect with an adjoining property. Nonetheless, it would extend at two storeys in height close to a prominent site boundary shared with a public footpath from where its two-storey height would create an unwelcome sense of enclosure to the footpath, contrary to the spacious character of the area. By virtue of its height, scale and massing the proposed extension would be an overly large and incongruous form of development which would dominate the host property and the wider street scene.
 6. The extension would remove a distinctive two storey bay window with chimney from the side elevation. The loss of this feature would conflict with the aims of the CACA, which identifies the loss of traditional fenestration patterns as a major concern for the quality of the architecture in the CA and notes that inappropriate replacements weaken the finish of the houses. The proposal would also conflict with The Hanger Hill (Haymill) Estate Conservation Area Management Plan (2008) (CAMP) which states that "within the conservation area there are a number of corner properties with distinctive chimney and window details, some with the entrance on the side frontage. Side extensions to the corner properties will not normally be permitted." The loss of this distinctive window and chimney detail would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property and would weaken the architectural quality and variety in the CA.
 7. The CAMP advises that the provision of hard standings over entire property frontages pose a threat to the character of the estate and that no more than 50% of the front garden area should be hard surfaced, with the remainder of the front garden planted and/or grassed. The proposal includes the removal of the front garden to form a parking area. The parking area would cover most of the site frontage. Whilst I observed that some properties in the surrounding area have parking areas which cover most of the site frontage, most properties retain a front garden, and consequently the green and spacious character of the area is maintained. The loss of most of the front garden to form the proposed parking area would result in an erosion of the green and spacious character of the area and would be contrary to the aims of the CAMP.
 8. As the appeal property is within a Conservation Area, I have therefore had special regard to section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act). I find that the excessive scale of the extension would appear dominant and out of keeping in the street scene, detracting from the distinctive character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area and create a sense of enclosure to the public footpath. Additionally, I find that the extension would result in the loss of a characteristic architectural detail and the parking area would result in an erosion of the green and spacious character of the area. Therefore, the proposal would harm the significance of the Hanger Hill (Haymills) Estate Conservation Area. I find that the harm would be less than substantial in this instance but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight.
 9. Under such circumstances, paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. There would be limited economic benefits

during construction of the proposed development but there is little substantive evidence that this would be sufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm that I have found.

10. My attention has been drawn to other similar extensions within the estate. However, no information has been provided on the location of these schemes or how and when the decisions were reached. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.
11. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Hanger Hill (Haymills) Estate Conservation Area. As such, it would be contrary to those aims of Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies 7.4, 7A, 7B and 7C of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) which seek to ensure that development delivers good design which reflects local character, complements the building and context and conserves the significance of heritage assets. I also find conflict with the Hanger Hill (Haymills) Estate Conservation Area Management Plan (2008) and the Hanger Hill (Haymills) Estate Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2008). I have also identified conflict with the Framework, which requires that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets. As a result, the proposal would not be in accordance with the development plan

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nichola Robinson

INSPECTOR