
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2024

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27.03.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/24/3336684
17 Howard Close, Ealing, London W3 0JY

- 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 Ms Mahya Fatemi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 234268HH, dated 21 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 6 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a front porch to a dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a front porch to a dwelling house at 17 Howard Close, Ealing, London W3 0JY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 234268HH, dated 21 October 2023, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; 01 and 02.
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The proposed development includes the erection of a ground floor front extension to a semi-detached dwelling which fronts the turning head of a cul-de-sac. At the time of the site visit, works were being undertaken to extend the property, including a side extension.
4. The other dwellings fronting the turning head are of a similar design with a ground floor bay window projecting from their front elevations. Some of the dwellings have been altered, including hipped to gable roof extensions and side extensions that now incorporate the main access door which has been relocated from the side elevation.

5. Some of the dwellings have modest sized front extensions in the form of porches, including 11, 15 and 18 Howard Close. No. 18 is the other property forming part of the pair of semi-detached dwellings with the appeal property. Exceptions to this are the front extensions at Nos. 1 and 4 whereby these additions incorporate the original bay window and a new porch. Although their detailed planning circumstances have not been provided, along with the other altered dwellings, Nos. 1 and 4 do form part of the character and appearance of the streetscene along the cul-de-sac as a whole.
6. The character of the residential streetscene is primarily established by the pairs of semi-detached dwellings which are set back a similar distance from the footways to the rear of landscaped front gardens, some of which are also used for off-street parking. This character is supplemented by the use of similar external materials. However, although there is some consistency in the siting and materials of the properties, because of the alterations which have been undertaken to a number of the dwellings the character and appearance of the streetscene is varied.
7. By reason of this variation, the proposed front extension would not be an incongruous or discordant form of development which would significantly detract from the character and appearance of the varied streetscene. Further, because of the alterations which have been undertaken at No. 18, the appeal scheme would not cause an unacceptable unbalancing of the appearance of this pair of semi-detached dwellings, particularly where alterations are ongoing at the appeal property. The side elevation of the proposed extension would be set back from the shared boundary thereby ensuring the property and No. 18 would remain as distinct dwellings.
8. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene and, as such, it would not conflict with Policies 7B and 7.4 of Ealing's Development Management Development Plan Document and Policy D4 of the London Plan. Amongst other matters, these policies refer to the design of extension to buildings meeting the identified design standards and developments being of a high quality of design complementing the scale and building pattern of the surrounding area.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested several conditions in the event this appeal succeeds which have been assessed against the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. For reasons of clarity, a condition is necessary to secure the erection of the proposed extension in accordance with the approved drawings. To assist with the assimilation of the appeal scheme into the surrounding area a condition for the external materials to match those of the property is necessary. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be allowed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR