



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 March 2023

by Kim Langford Tejrar LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/23/3314816
50 Cedar Grove, London W5 4AR

- 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 James Boak against the decision of London Borough of Ealing Council.
 - The application Ref 221888HH, dated 04 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is 'Front porch extension'
-

Procedural Matter

1. The description of development was changed following submission of the application. I have utilised the amended description, which better describes the development proposed.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the '*Front porch extension*' at 50 Cedar Grove, London W5 4AR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 221888HH, dated 04 May 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - a) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - b) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Elevations Revised Plan ref. CG-R01-PR-104 Dated 12.01.22, Proposed Elevation Revised Plan ref. CG-R01-PR-103 Dated 12.01.22, Proposed Floor Plans Revised ref. CG-R01-PR-102 Dated 12.01.22, Proposed Roof Plan Revised ref. CG-R01-PR-105 Dated 12.01.22.
 - c) Notwithstanding condition (b) above, the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in materials which match the external surfaces of the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached post-war dwelling of modest proportions and a simple utilitarian design. The site is located within a predominantly residential planned estate comprising of similar styles and types of dwellings, as well as modest sized apartment buildings of similar overall height and style to the houses in the vicinity. The prevailing scale, pattern and design of the estate creates a sense of place and uniformity, although the architectural features of the dwellings are unremarkable. The site is located at a curve in the road, so the house is set back from the road across a slightly deeper front garden than that of the surrounding properties on the same side of the road.
5. The appeal scheme seeks to introduce a single storey front porch extension to the front elevation. The width of the porch extension would be less than half the width of the original dwelling; which would be in proportion to the scale of the front elevation and its simple detailing. The depth of the porch would be modest; incorporating a front door and narrow window only. The height of the porch would be marginally higher than that of the existing small canopy porch, and it would not interfere the existing elevational arrangement, albeit it is regrettable that the front door would be situated in the flank of the porch rather than facing the street. As such, the porch would be proportionate to the scale and proportions of the existing dwelling and its simple form would integrate well its design.
6. Whilst the prevailing predominant porch type is a small above-door canopy, there are numerous examples of porch extensions of varied designs and scales in the immediate vicinity of the site. Indeed, the porch would be viewed within the context of a lean-to flank extension at a neighbouring property. For this reason, combined with the design and proportions of the porch, the scheme would be in keeping the local character and would not erode the sense of uniformity in the planned estate. Moreover, the site is not within a conservation area and the existing porches are a simple unobtrusive feature which make little contribution to the character of the area to justify their preservation.
7. Despite the location of the site at a curve in the road, the dwelling is no more prominent than the immediately surrounding dwellings on the same side of the road. Whilst the porch would create a modest front projection towards the road, the existing building line and pattern of development would not be adversely affected due to the combination of the modest depth of the porch, the orientation of the dwelling and its slightly deeper front garden. As such, the proposed porch would not be unduly prominent or dominant in the street scene.
8. For these reasons, the appeal scheme complies with policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan, adopted 2021 and policies 7B and 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management DPD, adopted 2013, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies seek, amongst other things, a design led approach to high quality design; having regard to contextual form, layout, pattern, scale, materials and detailing which complements the existing building and character of the area.

Conditions

9. The Council has requested three conditions requiring that the development is commenced within three years, is constructed in accordance with the approved plans and in materials which match the existing building. I consider these conditions to be reasonable and justified in accordance with the legal and policy

tests for conditions; to ensure that the development takes place in accordance with the proposed plans, in a timely manner and in a way that integrates it with the existing building and character of the area.

Conclusion

10. For these reasons, the appeal scheme accords with the relevant policies of the development plan and no material considerations indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is accordingly allowed.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR