



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 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/23/3324913

426 Greenford Avenue, Hanwell, Ealing W7 3DB

- 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 Mumtaz Saleem against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref PP-12033541 dated 21 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is part single-storey, part two-storey side/rear wrap around extension; first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council changed the description of development from that stated on the application form in the interests of clarity. I consider that the description accurately describes the appeal scheme and accordingly I have adopted an amended description in the heading above.
3. Since the submission of the appeal the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) has been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) (the Framework).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

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

Reasons

5. The site is a traditional two-storey end terraced property, located on the corner of Elmbank Way and Greenford Avenue within a predominantly residential area. Property form and design have an architectural rhythm in the area.
6. The proposed development would be in line with the existing first floor bedroom above the ground floor entrance hall of the property projecting to the side boundary of the plot and extending two-storey beyond the rear of the existing property, wrapping around to the rear. The proposed extension would be substantial and prominent on this corner plot.

7. I observed during my site visit that No. 428 Greenford Avenue has been extended to the front, side and rear, however the works to that property differ from the proposal before me. No. 428 is set back at the front, the two-storey side extension extends to the rear of the existing property, with a single storey rear extension projecting beyond the rear of the property. In this case the extensions are subordinate to the original property and do not appear out of keeping with the area.
8. I find that the proposed development would be an unsympathetic and incongruous addition to the property and the surrounding area in general.
9. I conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of the area. There is conflict Policies D3 and D4 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 which amongst other things seeks to ensure developments are designed to harmonise with the original building and are subordinate.

Conclusion

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

C Pipe

INSPECTOR