



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2023

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/22/3311318

41 Somerset Road, London W4 5DW

- 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 Mitchell Global 2 LTD against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 223096HH, dated 12 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "*single-storey rear wraparound extension: 4.0m depth, 2.5m to the eaves, 4.0m in height*"
-

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 host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mid-terrace, 2-storey house with accommodation within the roof and a 3-storey outrigger to the rear. Neighbouring properties in the terrace have small rear gardens and some include modest single-storey rear extensions. The appeal property benefits from a larger garden than its neighbours as extra land has been acquired to the rear and to the rear of the next door property.
4. There is an extant planning permission granted in 2021 for a single-storey wrap-around rear addition¹ which would occupy a large part of the rear garden but would be compatible with the scale of nearby rear additions. I recognise there is a high likelihood that this scheme would be carried out if this appeal is dismissed and therefore view it as a credible fall-back position to which I attach significant weight. I note that a Lawful Development Certificate has been gained for a single-storey addition to the rear of the outrigger². As this addition would be smaller than the extant planning permission scheme, and the appellant's clear aim is to maximise internal floor space, I consider it to be an unlikely fall-back scenario and therefore attribute limited weight to it.

¹ Application reference 214295HH

² Application reference 215791CPL

5. The proposal would comprise the erection of a single-storey wrap-around rear extension with a pitched roof. This would be similar to the 2021 permission in respect of its height and appearance. However, it would have a far larger footprint than the 2021 scheme, it would occupy almost the entirety of the original garden area, and the rear elevation would almost align with the rear garden boundaries of the properties to either side. Due to its substantial footprint and significant rear protrusion, the proposal would be an incongruous and overly prominent form of development that would be at odds with the prevailing pattern of development in the terrace.
6. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. It therefore fails to comply with Policies 7.4, 7B and 7D of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) which, amongst other matters, require good design which pays regard to local character and complements the scale of development in the area. There is also conflict with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 4 - Residential Extensions, which states that rear extensions should be subordinate to the original dwelling, and the design aims of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR