



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 November 2023

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12.12.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/23/3326269

51 Kenton Avenue, Southall, Ealing UB1 3QG

- 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 Didar Singh Dhillon against the decision of Ealing Council.
 - The application Ref 231828HH dated 10 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2023.
 - The development proposed comprises retaining of canopy structure with side sheets removed at rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. At the time of my site visit, the development was in place. The application form made clear that the scheme had been submitted retrospectively and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.
3. The Council changed the description of development from that stated on the application form in the interests of clarity. I consider that the condensed description accurately describes the appeal scheme and accordingly I have adopted an amended description in the heading above.
4. Since the submission of the appeal the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) has been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (the Framework). However, in relation to this appeal the aims of both sets of policies are similar. No party would be prejudiced or caused any injustice by me proceeding with the appeal in light of this change in policy.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The site is a traditional two-storey semi-detached property within a predominantly residential area. Property form and design have an architectural rhythm in the area.
7. The development is located to the rear of the property, however due to the gap between the appeal site and neighbouring property, the canopy is visible to a degree from the streetscene.

8. Whilst the side sheets have been removed from the development, the scale along with the materials used, timber and polycarbonate, create an alien addition when view against the host property and the area in general. The canopy is an unsympathetic and incongruous addition to the property.
9. I conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of the area. There is conflict Policies D4 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management DPD (2013) which amongst other things seek to ensure developments deliver good design and complement the building in terms of materials and design.
10. There is conflict with the Framework which seeks amongst other things to ensure developments are of good design. There is also conflict with Supplementary Planning Document 4 – Residential Extensions (2004) which amongst other things seeks to ensure developments are designed to fit in with the original building and that matching materials are used.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR