
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2024

by Stephen Wilkinson BA BPI DIP LA MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C5270/W/23/3331520

23 Bankside, Southall, Ealing, UB1 1NQ

- 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 Jawad Malik against the decision of LB Ealing.
 - The application Ref 232911FUL, dated 30 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 24 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey 1 bed dwelling with associated landscaping and boundary treatments works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the appeal scheme on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The area surrounding the appeal site comprises short terraces of two storey residential properties with long rear gardens.
4. The appeal site is part of the rear garden of an end of terrace two storey residential property which would be accessed via an existing pedestrian gate at the side of the property.
5. The Development Plan comprises the London Plan (LP) (2021), the Ealing Core Strategy (2012) and Development Management DPD (2013).
6. The appeal scheme comprises a single storey 1 bed dwelling comprising around 53 s.metres and includes a separate garden created through the sub division of the existing. Its overall ridge height would be around 3.9metres. It would be constructed of brick with a tile roof.
7. Whilst LP Policies H1, H2 and GG2 recognise the importance of optimising land for housing and in particular the importance of small sites to increasing the supply of homes there is a common thread expressed through Policies LPD3 and D4 requiring development to reflect a site's context and that schemes should be design led to respond to the character of the surrounding area.
8. Although Core Policies 1a) and b) and 3.1a) reinforce the importance of increasing housing supply in the Borough, particularly in the A40 corridor these policies require to be balanced with a need for good design, reflected in Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Council's DPD. In particular, these require development to

complement the surrounding building pattern and make a positive visual impact.

9. The National Planning Policy Framework (2023), (the Framework) policies acknowledge the importance of additional housing but also the need to secure good design .
10. Whilst many of the terraced properties surrounding the appeal site include single storey outbuildings located at the end of long rear gardens, they are small and subservient in scale both to the size of garden within which they lie and the main properties and importantly do not involve subdivision of the garden area.
11. It is acknowledged that the Council's Housing Design Guide (2022) recognises that dwellings of subservient scale could be acceptable in backland sites. However, the appeal scheme would be far larger in scale than the existing outbuildings and its height would contribute to its prominence when viewed from surrounding properties. These adverse visual impacts would be exacerbated by its location two thirds of the way down the garden contrasting with the long gardens which characterise this terrace of properties.
12. The harm arising from the appeal scheme on the character and appearance of the surrounding area would exceed any benefit to increasing housing supply.
13. For these reasons, I conclude that the appeal scheme adversely impacts on the character and appearance of the area conflicting with Policies LPD3 and D4 and 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing DMD Plan.
14. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

Stephen Wilkinson

INSPECTOR