



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 May 2023

**by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 24 May 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/23/3314916**

**30 Ferrymead Gardens, Ealing, Greenford UB6 9NF**

- 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 Raju Thapa against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
  - The application Ref 224336HH, dated 10 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 December 2022.
  - The development proposed is described as a 'first floor side and rear extension and dormer loft conversion similar to 24 Ferrymead Gardens'.
- 

### 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 property and the area.

### Reasons

3. The Ealing Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document No 4 ('SPD') sets out at section 4.0 that as side extensions are often very visible from the street, it is important that they do not detract from the original dwelling or from the area's character. It continues that two storey side extensions should appear subordinate to the original house.
4. The host property sits on a wedge-shaped plot, with a wide highway frontage. It is prominently positioned on the corner of Ferrymead Gardens and Chinnor Crescent, with its principal front face set at an angle to the road junction. It benefits from a first floor side extension, which turns the corner to face Chinnor Crescent, along with a single storey extension which wraps around to the side and rear.
5. In common with the host, most nearby properties are arranged in semi-detached pairs, thus providing a sense of pattern to the streetscene. Many have substantial rear dormers and other rear extensions. However, other than hip to gable alterations and some side extensions on corner plots, to the front most broadly retain their original form.

6. Given its rearward siting, and the presence of similar roof alterations nearby, the proposed rear dormer would not harm the area's character and appearance.
7. However, having regard to cumulative impacts, the proposed side extension above the existing ground floor extension would give the resultant property a very elongated front face at first floor level, and a significant bulk; and it would overwhelm the original dwelling's form and proportions. It would also markedly disrupt the balance and harmony of this semi-detached pair, which would take on the appearance of a short terrace. The scheme would thus significantly harm the rhythm of the streetscene.
8. There are some large side extensions on nearby corner plots, including at 24 Ferrymead Gardens, but that one does not wrap around the corner, and its front face does not appear as long as the existing and proposed extensions here. Having regard to cumulative impacts, none of the nearby examples that I observed overwhelm the host to the extent of this scheme; and they do not disrupt the pattern and balance of the streetscene to the same degree.
9. The scheme would not reduce the host's small outdoor rear amenity space. However, for the above reasons, it would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. Consequently, it would conflict with Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document 2013 Policies 7.4 and 7B. In broad terms and amongst other things, these require high quality design with appropriate levels of development, which complements local character having regard to matters such as scale and building patterns.
10. It would also conflict with those parts of London Plan 2021 Policies D3 and D4 which require good design that enhances the local context and responds to its character, with regard to matters such as scale, appearance, form and proportions; and with the advice in the SPD.
11. In its favour, the appellant states that the scheme would meet the family's requirements; and that it would embrace the principles of sustainable design, although I have few specific details of that.
12. In any event, those limited benefits would not outweigh the significant harm that the scheme would cause. The proposal would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

*Chris Couper*

INSPECTOR