



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 May 2024

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/23/3334054

22 St Andrews Road, Acton, Ealing W3 7NE

- 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 Ijaz Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 233669FUL, dated 10 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 27 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a two storey dwellinghouse; provision of associated refuse storage and cycle parking and front boundary treatment.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council has raised concerns about the accuracy of the application drawings. Whilst I note there are some anomalies, I am satisfied that the information before me is sufficient to enable me to assess the proposal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effects of the proposals on:
 - (i) the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and
 - (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 27 Brassie Avenue, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is located next to the junction between St Andrews Road and Brassie Avenue and is occupied by a 2-storey detached house. The surrounding area comprises predominately red brick, 2-storey, terraced houses with red tiled, hipped roofs. They possess similar design features and proportions giving the street a high level of architectural uniformity. These terraces, and the dwelling within the appeal site, are all set back from the road a similar distance therefore establishing a very clear prevailing front building line and uniform pattern of development.

5. The proposal would comprise the erection of a 2-storey, 3-bedroom house with a dual-pitched roof. This would be attached to 22 St Andrews Road and occupy a large proportion of the space between No.22 and the neighbouring terrace. The application drawings indicate that the street elevation would comprise light red brick at ground floor level and light grey render at the upper level, and the roof would be clad in grey tiles. A hard-surfaced off street parking space is proposed to the side of the house and a small garden would be created to the rear.
6. The frontage of the proposed dwelling would be about 2m forward of that of No.22 and a similar distance forward of the front building line of the neighbouring terrace. The composition of the front elevation and the gable ended roof form would be at odds with the scale, proportions, form and design of No.22 and would also fail to respond in any meaningful way to the form, rhythm and proportions of the neighbouring terraces. The stepping forward, together with the absence of any obvious design response to the neighbouring properties would result in an overly prominent and highly incongruous addition to the street scene.
7. Due to its siting, scale, proportions, materials and overall design I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such it is contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) and London Plan (2021) Policies D1, D3, D4 and D5 which, amongst other matters, require high quality design that pays regard to local character. There is also conflict with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).
8. As each planning application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits I accord limited weight to the recently constructed house next to 12 St Andrews Road, which I note essentially duplicates the host building in terms of its design and siting.

Living conditions

9. The proposed 2-storey house would be sited relatively close to the rear boundary of the appeal site immediately beyond which is the rear garden of 27 Brassie Avenue. The proposal would result in a reduction in outlook from the rear garden of No.27 and some increased sense of enclosure. However, due to the openness of the land on the other side of the garden, I am satisfied that adequate levels of outlook from No.27 would be maintained and the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.27. For this reason the proposal accords with DPD Policies 7A and 7B in this particular respect.

Conclusion

10. Although I have found that the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.27, for the reasons set out under the first main issue, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole INSPECTOR