



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 April 2024

by N Robinson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/23/3328507

The Laurels and The Hollies, Edgehill Road, West Ealing, Ealing W13 8HW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Janice Yu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 231606FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as "Joint application with The Hollies- Double-storey rear conservatory extension."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Joint application with The Hollies - Double-storey rear conservatory extension at The Laurels and The Hollies, Edgehill Road, West Ealing, Ealing W13 8HW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 231606FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings: ST_DEC22_THE HOL_00, ST_DEC22_THE HOL_003, ST_DEC22_THE HOL_004.
 3. No development hereby permitted shall take place above foundation level until full details of all external facing materials have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the details thus approved, which shall thereafter be retained.
 4. No development shall commence until a scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council to ensure the staging of the construction of the development is undertaken concurrently across properties The Laurels and The Hollies. The development shall be carried out in accordance with these details as approved.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 19 December 2023, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been significantly amended. As a result, I consider that there is no requirement for me to seek further submissions and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by my taking this approach.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area including the Grange and White Ledges Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a pair of modern, large 3-storey red brick semi-detached dwellings which are located on Edgehill Road. Both properties have single storey conservatory extensions of differing designs to the rear. The appeal site is located in the Grange and White Ledges Conservation Area (CA) and consequently I have a duty¹ to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area.
5. The CA covers the 'Grange' and 'White Ledges' estates. The appeal site is located within 'the Edgehill Road and Castlebar Hill Sub Area' which comprises predominantly large detached Victorian and Edwardian houses and later additions in a Victorian and Edwardian aesthetic. Dwellings are typically set back from the road in spacious plots. This, along with the width of the road, grass verges and mature planting within streets and front gardens gives this part of the CA a verdant and spacious character that reflects the historic settlement pattern and, in combination with the historical connection to the Grange and White Ledges estates and the quality of architectural design, appears to be a key part of its significance.
6. Dwellings on Edgehill Road comprise a mixture of large 2 and 3 storey Victorian and Edwardian dwellings and modern infill properties. The appeal properties are later additions. Given this and the limited visibility of the rear elevation from the surrounding area it appears that the positive contribution the appeal properties make to the CA relates to the layout and form of the buildings, as opposed to the rear elevation.
7. The appeal proposal seeks consent for the erection of a 2-storey rear extension which would span both properties. The extension would be similar in width and depth to the existing conservatories. In the context of the large 3-storey host dwellings, the proposed 2-storey extension would sit comfortably on the rear of the host properties and would not appear excessive in scale. The use of frameless glass would reduce the apparent bulk and mass of the extension and would be in keeping with the modern appeal properties. Consequently, the extension would be viewed as a sympathetic addition to the appeal properties which would respect the proportions, form and architectural features of the dwellings. Thus, the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the scale, character or appearance of the host buildings.
8. Furthermore, there would be limited visibility of the proposed extension from neighbouring properties and public vantage points, limiting the impact of the proposal on the street scene. Thus, there would be no adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA and the significance of the heritage asset would therefore not be harmed.
9. In light of the above, the proposal would comply with those aims of Policies D3, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies 7.4, 7B and 7C of the

¹ under s72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) which, amongst other matters, require that development should be informed by and complement its surroundings and be sympathetic in its materials and architectural detailing, and that proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance.

10. I find no conflict with those aims of the Grange and White Ledges Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2000) and the Grange and White Ledges Conservation Area Management Plan (2009) which seek to resist unsightly and over-scale rear, side or roof extensions and require that special attention should be paid not to allow developments that could cause a threat to its character. I also find no conflict with the Framework which requires that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets.

Other Matters

11. The northern site boundary is bordered by a thick screen of vegetation and the proposal would be unlikely to result in opportunities for overlooking of the rear garden to neighbouring property Rosslyn. There is limited boundary planting to the southern site boundary and the proposal would result in opportunities for overlooking of the garden of the neighbouring property Port Quin from a small first floor 'roof terrace' area. This would be similar in siting and depth to the existing roof terrace, from which I observed that there is presently a degree of overlooking of this garden. Whilst it is suggested that the lawfulness of this existing roof terrace is not known, it is not for me, as part of this planning appeal, to establish this. Given this I am satisfied that the proposal will not result in any further overlooking of the garden to this property than presently exists.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to specify the approved plans in the interest of certainty. In the interest of the character and appearance of the appeal properties, a condition is necessary to control the external materials of the development. I have attached a condition to ensure that no development can be undertaken until a scheme which sets out that the development will be staged and programmed concurrently has been approved by the Council, before any development can take place due to the potential effect on the living conditions of the occupants of The Laurels and The Hollies respectively and the character and appearance of the appeal properties.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

N Robinson

INSPECTOR