
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2024

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/23/3328067

10 Cranborne Avenue, Southall UB2 4HY

- 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 Varinder Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 232263HH, dated 6 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is part single, part two storey rear extension, first floor side extension and conversion of garage into habitable room and front garage extension in line with the proposed porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part single, part two storey rear extension, first floor side extension and conversion of garage into habitable room and front garage extension in line with the proposed porch, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 232263HH, dated 6 June 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 3499-01/MT, 3499-02/MT, 3499-03/MT, 3499-04/MT, 3499-05/MT, 3499-06/MT and 3499-07/MT.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary matter

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 19 December 2023, during consideration of the appeal. Having regard to the changes in the Framework and to the comparatively minor scale and nature of this appeal proposal, I consider that further consultation on this matter is not necessary.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the house and Cranborne Avenue.

Reasons

4. 10 Cranborne Avenue is a semi-detached house set within a suburban street of mainly semi-detached houses of similar style, but with enough variation so that the street has a capacity to absorb further change. Like many others on the street, No 10 has a 2 storey height bay window at the front. A similar set of extensions has previously been approved here, with the most notable change being that in this scheme the garage to be converted would be extended forward, beyond the line of the bay window, to link with a front porch extension.
5. The Council's concern is that this forward extension would be an unsympathetic addition to the street elevation, detracting from the bay as a feature. It is notable, however, that numbers of houses on the street including at No 8 next door have similar front projections up to or beyond the line of their bay windows. These are an established part of the street character and are not harmful or even particularly noticeable features in the varied street scene. The proposed low single storey front extension has been modestly designed to fit in well within this context. It would not challenge the much taller and more substantial bay window as the main architectural element of the frontage.
6. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the house or Cranborne Avenue. It accords with London Plan policies D3 and D4, the Council's Development Management Development Plan Document policies 7.4 and 7B and the Framework, which aim to secure good design that complements the local street sequence, building pattern, scale, materials and detailing.
7. I impose a condition specifying the relevant plans to provide certainty and a condition requiring the use of matching materials to protect local character and appearance. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR