



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2023

by L Reid BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/23/3315921

66 Grafton Road, Acton W3 6PF

- 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 Mark Herlihy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 224419HH, dated 17 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is ground floor single storey rear-side wrap around extension plus first floor part rear extension to single dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. In Part E of the appeal form, it is stated that the description of development has not changed, but a different wording has been entered. Neither of the parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development was agreed. I have therefore used the one given on the original application.
3. The Council has confirmed SPD4 cited in the decision notice has been superseded by the Ealing Design Guidance – B Report (2022). Both parties have had the opportunity to comment on this. I have therefore had regard to this document in my decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a three-storey terraced house. It is situated on a road comprised of residential properties that appear to be of a similar age and design, some of which have previously been extended. The house has a single storey rear return, and the historical form and architectural features of the house are still legible. It therefore makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
6. Notwithstanding the appellant's assertion that the ground floor extension has been designed to meet the requirements of the Ealing Design Guidance, the ground floor extension would extend beyond the rear return, spanning the full width of the house connecting to the side of the rear return. Consequently, its

total depth would be greater than 3.5m. As it would appear to extend beyond the rear return to a greater depth than the ground floor of the neighbouring houses, a ground floor extension of this scale and size would be uncharacteristic of the terrace. Furthermore, the part flat roof design would not be in keeping with the existing roof shapes and would appear incongruous in this context.

7. One of the adjoining houses has a sizeable two storey rear extension. However, this neighbouring extension appears to be set in from the boundaries and sits below the eaves of the main roof. This therefore does not match the design of the proposed first floor extension which would be directly adjacent to the boundary and would in part project above the eaves. This design would create an awkward juxtaposition between the extension and the main roof. When combined with the design of the ground floor extension, the various competing roof forms would give the rear elevation a disjointed appearance.
8. As a result of the extension's combined depth, width, scale and massing, the proposal would completely consume the rear of the house and would be a disproportionate addition. When taken as a whole, the extensions would be overly dominant and would therefore lack subservience. Furthermore, given the considerable size, when combined with the closeness to the site boundaries, the extensions would overall create a visually cramped development.
9. I therefore find that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. Consequently, it would be contrary to Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013). When taken together, these policies require development to positively respond to the local context through its scale and appearance, having due regard to the existing form and proportions of the building, and be of the highest architectural quality in order to complement the area. It would also be contrary to the guidance in the Ealing Design Guidance – B Report (2022) which seeks to achieve development that enhances the local character.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge the appellant's comments in relation to the diverse character of the area and the variation in other extensions in the surrounding area. However, it would appear that these existing extensions are not directly comparable to the proposal in terms of size and scale. Furthermore, I have not been made aware of the individual circumstances that led to them being built. In any case, every appeal must be considered on its own merits. The presence of other extensions in the area does not justify the harm to the character and appearance that I have identified above.
11. The second reason for refusal on the Council's decision notice refers to the development's plot coverage and proximity to site boundaries, representing a cramped and incongruous form of development, resulting in an unacceptable loss of garden space to the house. I have considered the effect of this on the character and appearance above. It is not particularly clear from the Council's officer report or decision notice if harm to the living conditions of existing occupants is a concern. The officer report also refers to loss of sunlight and poor living conditions for biodiversity, however, these matters are not given as reasons for refusal. From my site visit, I am content that the development would not result in unacceptable harm in either context. Nevertheless, a lack of

harm in these respects is neutral and weighs neither for nor against the development.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, I find that the proposal conflicts with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that have been shown to carry sufficient weight to indicate a decision otherwise in accordance with it. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Reid

INSPECTOR

