



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2024

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/24/3339215

12 Worcester Gardens, Greenford, Ealing UB6 0BH

- 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 Agnieszka Byrne against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 234786HH.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'single storey front extension following demolition of single storey front porch extension; partial demolition of the existing single storey, part two storey, rear extension; demolition of the existing first floor front infill extension; partial demolition of the existing rear roof extension; and associated external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters and Background

2. I have taken the description of the development from the appeal form, which the appellant states was changed from that on the application form. The revised description is consistent with the description on the notification letters sent to nearby residents, and with that cited in the Council's decision.
3. The application the subject of this appeal followed a previous dismissed appeal against an enforcement notice (Ref: APP/A5270/C/22/3297862) ('dismissed appeal'), and earlier approved applications for extensions to the host property (Ref: 185446NMA and 185315HH). However, as set out in the decision letter for the dismissed appeal, Ref: 185446NMA was a non-material amendment to a development approved under Ref: PP/2011/1763, which was never implemented and had expired; and Ref: 185315HH was also never implemented and expired in 2022.
4. Thus, whilst they illustrate that the Council has approved significant alterations to the property, I have considered the scheme before me as a whole, and on its planning merits, rather than just compared to those previous approvals.
5. As the scheme seeks to retain some of the development that has taken place at the property whilst modifying other parts of it, I have dealt with the scheme before me as a proposal, rather than as the retention of existing development.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

7. The properties in Worcester Gardens are set back from the road in two storey terraces or semi-detached pairs. Seen from the highway, they share many similar features, such as two storey front-facing bay windows, fairly regular fenestration, and porches with canopies or an arched design. Those characteristics, together with the houses' fairly modest scale, and a common palette of facing materials including brick, pebble dash, and hanging tiles between the ground and first floor bay windows, provide a sense of cohesion and uniformity to the streetscene.
8. The scheme before me includes a two storey front facing gable which, unlike nearby properties' bay windows, would have squared-off corners at first floor, and a single large window; and which would project slightly further forward compared to its attached neighbour and the other properties in this terrace. As a result, it would have a bulky and awkward appearance, which would be markedly at odds with the first floor, tapered-edge, bays with tripartite windows and hanging tiles, which are so characteristic of the area. As acknowledged by the appellant, it would also be 0.4 metre wider compared to that approved under Ref: 185446NMA.
9. The two storey side extension would have a ridge which would be set down slightly compared to the host's principal ridgeline. Whilst that set down would be slightly less than the 0.5 metre recommended in the Council's SPD 4 Residential Extensions ('SPD'), when considered together with the proposed set back at first floor level, that part of the scheme would achieve a suitably subordinate appearance when viewed from the front of the property.
10. However, that extension would wraparound the side of the building to connect to a two storey rear extension, which would not be set in from the side wall, resulting in a long, largely unalleviated, flank. From the rear it would be seen in conjunction with a large, flat-roofed dormer, which would cover most of the building's original sloping roof.
11. Whilst a rear dormer was approved under Ref: 185315HH, the cumulative impact of all the development before me would be to subsume the original property. The resultant building's scale and overly complex form would jar with the simpler and more modest proportions, and more cohesive style, of nearby properties, including its attached neighbour. It would also have a more complex form and a greater bulk, particularly at roof level, compared to Refs: 185315HH or 185446NMA.
12. The appellant states that the existing roller shutters, which the Inspector in the dismissed appeal considered to highlight the alterations that had been carried out, could be removed; but is unclear from the evidence before me whether the existing render and roofing materials, which that Inspector also found to be unsuitable, would be replaced.
13. Notwithstanding that uncertainty, and the changes that are proposed compared to the dismissed appeal, the scheme would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
14. It would therefore conflict with London Plan 2021 Policies D3 and D4, and with Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document 2013 Policies 7B and 7.4. In general terms, these require good, coherent design, which

responds to local character and distinctiveness, achieves a positive visual impact, and complements the area, having regard to matters such as scale, form, massing, detailing and materials. It would also conflict with the broadly similar general principles at Part 3.0 of the SPD.

15. Summing up, I have found that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole and, having regard to all other matters raised, including representations by interested parties, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR