



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2023

by Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/23/3331324

2 Stanhope Park Road, Greenford UB6 9LT

- 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 M Y Toraub against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 232123HH, dated 30 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 24 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is single storey, part two storey, side/rear (wrap around) extension, following demolition of existing rear addition.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey, part two storey, side/rear (wrap around) extension, following demolition of existing rear addition at 2 Stanhope Park Road, Greenford UB6 9LT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 232123HH, dated 30 May 2023 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents: Site Location Plan; 201 Existing Ground Floor and First Floor Plans; 202A Proposed Ground Floor and First Floor Plans; 203 A1 Existing and Proposed Roof Plans; 204 Existing Elevations; 205 A2 Proposed Side Elevations; 206 A3 Proposed Front and Rear Elevations and Block Plans.

Preliminary Matters

2. During the determination of the application, the council changed the description of development in order to clarify it. For accuracy, I have used the description of development on the decision notice.

Reasons

3. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposals on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene.

4. Stanhope Park Road is a pleasant residential street with a suburban character. The street contains mostly semi-detached, two storey houses and bungalows, set behind front gardens, with off-street parking and good-sized rear gardens. The dwellings in the part of the street around the appeal property are characterised by distinctive gambrel roof designs.
5. No. 2 (the appeal property) is a semi-detached two storey house which is located close to the junction of Stanhope Park Road and Croyde Avenue. It has a driveway to the side and shares a boundary with the rear driveway and garage serving No 9 Croyde Avenue.
6. At the site visit, I noticed that the host dwelling is situated at a higher floor level than that of its neighbour at No 9 Croyde Avenue which has a rear garden and rear driveway access facing the flank wall of the appeal property. However, the council did not identify that there would be harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 9 (or nearest neighbours).
7. Policy 7B (Design Amenity) of the Ealing Development Management DPD (2013) (DMDPD) seeks high standards of amenity to be achieved through design. Policy LV7.4 (Local Character) of the DMDPD supports development proposals that complement their surroundings, particularly in terms of street sequence, building pattern, scale, materials and detailing.
8. The council have a Housing Design Guidance (2022) supplementary planning document (SPD) which provides guidance for the design of new and alterations to existing dwellings in the Borough.
9. I have been made aware that a proposal for a single storey side/rear wraparound extension was granted planning permission in April 2023 and have considered this as a 'fallback' position which could clearly be implemented in the event that this appeal fails. That said, it is also clear to me that the fallback position is of a lower scale than that which is proposed here, and I do not consider them to be comparable as a result.
10. The appeal proposals would replicate the existing permission on the ground floor, with the addition of the first-floor side and rear extensions. The side extension that would be of a traditional design that would not exactly match the roof profile of the host dwelling, but it would be of a similar pitch.
11. The council consider this to be unacceptably at odds with the gambrel roof design. However, as the proposed side and rear extension roof lines are set sufficiently below the existing ridge line it would clearly be seen as a subservient and contemporary addition that would not 'compete' with the character of the host dwelling.
12. I also note the council's argument that there is no side extension 'precedent' in the area, but there are few opportunities for this, given the limited spacing between many of the neighbouring dwellings. In any case, I have determined this appeal on its own merits and in light of the more unique position of the host dwelling, being located at the end of the street.
13. I have considered the potential for a cumulative impact on character of the addition of the first-floor extensions above and beyond the permitted scheme. I do not agree that there would be a particularly harmful cumulative impact, as the first-floor additions would largely be viewed from the front of the dwelling. At the site visit I looked at the appeal site from Croyde Avenue and consider

that only glimpses of the site from Croyde Avenue would be possible, so the scale of the proposals would be in my view, far harder to discern.

14. It is true that the additional development over and above that of the established planning permission would add significant amounts of development to the host dwelling. However, these appeal proposals would not, in my view add so much more development that it would be detrimental to the character of the host dwelling or the wider area.
15. I therefore do not consider that the appeal proposals would offend policies Policy 7B or LV7.4 of the DMDPD, nor the relevant parts of the SPD.

Conclusions

16. In addition to the standard commencement condition (1), a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and a condition requiring matching facing materials (2) in order to protect the character and appearance of the area. Finally, I have added a condition (3) requiring that development is undertaken in accordance with the approved plans, which are listed for precision and for the avoidance of doubt.
17. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions set out above.

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR