



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2022

**by Juliet Rogers BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 25 November 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/22/3297064**

**50 Pleasant Way, Wembley HA0 1DF**

- 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 Rama Veeturi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
  - The application Ref 214803FUL, dated 14 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 March 2022.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension and part single, part two storey rear extension, single storey entrance porch and conversion of the dwellinghouse into two self-contained flats (2x2bed), provision of one off-street parking space, cycle storage units, amenity space, waste storage and soft and hard landscaping.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary Matters

2. Prior approval<sup>1</sup> for a single storey rear extension and certificate of lawfulness<sup>2</sup> for loft conversion with hip to gable alteration and rear dormer have recently been approved for the appeal site. As these structures were substantially complete at the time of my site visit and are shown on the application plans as existing, I have assessed the appeal accordingly.
3. A planning application<sup>3</sup> for the conversion of the property into two self-contained flats including a part single storey, part two storey side and rear extensions (following demolition of existing conservatory) has also been approved. Based on my observations during my site visit, this development has not been implemented. The appellant considers the appeal scheme comprises design related amendments to this approved planning application that rationalises the various approvals. However, as the now implemented loft conversion, did not form part of the approved planning application, and the extensions differ in size and design, my decision is based on the appeal scheme as a whole.

## Main Issue

4. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

---

<sup>1</sup> Prior approval Ref 166396PALHE

<sup>2</sup> Certificate of Lawfulness Ref 172862CPL

<sup>3</sup> Planning application Ref 190419/FUL

## Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached property located at the end of a row of similar two storey dwellings. The wider residential area comprises predominantly semi-detached two storey properties of various forms, scales and designs. A large proportion of the properties in the area have been altered and extended, including conversions to flatted development and loft extensions. Despite the lack of uniformity in the building form or coherent streetscenes in the area, where dwellings have been extended, these additions are subordinate to their host buildings.
6. The proposed development includes extensions to the front, side and rear which, combined with the already implemented additions would result in a substantial enlargement of the original dwelling. The two storey side extension and front porch would extend the dwelling to the side boundary, using a series of steps back in the front elevation. The appellant argues that, due to its width and roofscape design and lower ridgeline, the site extension would improve the visual symmetry of the property. I find, however, that combined with the projection of the wide porch towards the front boundary, the frontage would be dominated by discordant and unsympathetic additions to the original dwelling.
7. Whilst parts of the appeal scheme would be screened from public view, the proposed front and side extensions would be clearly visible in the large gap between the appeal property and 52 Pleasant Way. Additionally, the extensions to the first floor would also be experienced from the garden areas of properties nearby. Even if I were to conclude that the single storey rear extension visually anchors the property, this does not justify the substantial proposed extensions to the front and side.
8. Irrespective of the use of a high quality palette of materials and matching fenestration, the scale and massing of the proposed development would engulf the original property. As such, it would introduce uncommon, bulky and incongruous features into the surrounding area. Although the Council acknowledge that the porch, in isolation, would not be 'completely harmful', it would, nonetheless, cause harm to the character and appearance.
9. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy 7.4 of the DPD<sup>4</sup>. These policies, amongst other aspects, seek to ensure development complements the local area and prevailing form of development through a design-led approach to delivering high quality design.
10. On the decision notice the Council also refer to Policy D8 of the London Plan. As this relates to the public realm, it is not determinative in this case.

## Other Matters

11. Even if I were to conclude that the proposed development would not cause harm to the living conditions of existing or future occupiers in respect of amenity space, bins and cycle storage, these would be neutral factors in my assessment. Similarly, concluding that the proposed development would not prejudice highway safety would not outweigh the harm identified above. The

---

<sup>4</sup> Ealing Development Management – Development Plan Document (2013) (the DPD)

lack of heritage designation to the property or within the surrounding area is not a reason, in itself, to permit unacceptable development.

12. Although there is a significant likelihood that, regardless of my decision, the development subject to the approved planning application would be constructed, this would not result in the unacceptable harm I have identified above. Therefore, I place little weight on it in reaching my decision.
13. My attention has been drawn to other policies in the London Plan, relating to ten-year targets<sup>5</sup> for net housing completions and the pro-active support of new homes on small sites<sup>6</sup>. Whilst making an efficient use of a small site and able to make a limited contribution to the overall housing supply with a mix of unit sizes<sup>7</sup>, the economic and social benefits of the proposed development would be also be limited. Although in a location with a PTAL<sup>8</sup> of 2, accessible to certain services and facilities, these small benefits would not outweigh the environmental harm the proposed development would cause to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the proposed development would not achieve all the interdependent objectives of sustainable development, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.
14. The fact that the appellant has been working with the Council to make changes to the proposed development and considers this appeal to be the last resort, does not alter my assessment of the case.

## **Conclusion**

15. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweigh the harm and associated development plan conflict. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

*Juliet Rogers*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>5</sup> Policy H1 Increasing housing supply

<sup>6</sup> Policy H2 Small sites

<sup>7</sup> Policy H10 Housing size mix

<sup>8</sup> Public Transport Accessibility Level rating