



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/22/3310903

100 Rusthall Avenue, London W4 1BS

- 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 & Mrs Ribbons against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 223258HH, dated 25 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing annexe and the erection of a replacement annexe with a car port for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the main dwellinghouse and associated alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant's agent advises that revised drawings were submitted to the Council showing the proposed car port omitted and the Council determined the planning application on this basis. However, the drawings before me, which are dated May 2022, clearly show a car port. The descriptions of development used by the Council on the decision notice and in the officer's report both refer to a car port and there is nothing before me to confirm that revised drawings were submitted and taken into account in the Council's determination of the planning application. I am required to consider the appeal against the drawings before me and therefore the description of development in the banner heading above refers to the car port.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a handsome, locally listed, 2-storey house. It is situated in a residential street comprising generally closely-spaced houses of similar age and appearance. Unlike its neighbours, the appeal property occupies a relatively large plot of land including space to one side of the house. Within this area there is a double garage with a pitched roof, hardstanding, a substantial mature Cedar tree and vegetation. Whilst the garage is a relatively big outbuilding in an urban context, it is set back from the road and modest in

height compared to the neighbouring buildings and vegetation. As a consequence, it is a relatively modest feature in the street scene.

5. The proposal would involve the removal of the garage and its replacement with a single-storey annexe building containing an office, gym and games room. This would be taller than the garage and its frontage would be appreciably closer to the road. It would have a significantly larger footprint than the garage, being roughly equivalent in size to a 2-bedroom bungalow. The drawings before me show a car port in front of the proposed annexe building and the expansion of the area of hardstanding under the Cedar tree. The proposal would require the removal of some vegetation next to the side boundary of the appeal property and a reduction in the space available for planting at the front of the site.
6. I appreciate that the timber clad design of the proposal would be appropriate in a garden setting and that the proposal would be subordinate to the house in terms of its height. However, the proposal would be significantly larger than the garage it would replace and closer to the road and would only be partially screened from view by vegetation. As a consequence of its size and siting it would be an incongruous and overly prominent outbuilding that would be at odds with the pattern of development in the area.
7. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. It therefore fails to accord with Policies 7.4, 7B and 7C of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) which, amongst other matters, require good design which pays regard to local character and heritage assets and complements the scale of development in the area. There is also conflict with the aims of Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

Conclusion

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

S Poole

INSPECTOR