



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2024

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/24/3345203

2 Gibbon Road, Acton, London W3 7AE

- 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 Mr F Yousuf against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application reference is 235079HH.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a first-floor extension of 1.6m to the side and 4.5m to the rear. Replacement of existing side brick extension. Ground floor rear extension 4m deep with flat roof. Demolition of the garage outbuilding and erection of replacement outbuilding. Changing windows to aluminium frame double glazed windows. Changing main and adjoining hip roofs to gable roofs. The addition of 10 roof windows. 8 PV collectors laid flat to southern extension flat roof.
-

Procedural matter

1. The appellant has described the proposal as in the above heading whereas the Council has referred to it as an alteration of the main roof profile from a hip to gable end and over a 2-storey side extension; conversion of the roof space into habitable use; installation of 10 roof lights to the front and rear roof slopes; a single storey rear extension; a 2-storey side and rear extension; associated internal alterations; construction of an outbuilding following demolition of the existing garage; replacement of all windows; and the installation of 8 PV collectors. From my inspection of the plans, I consider that the Council's description more fully and clearly expresses the development sought although I note that a new electronic sliding gate is also proposed along the frontage of the site to Bowes Road. I have assessed the proposal on that basis.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the erection of a first-floor extension of 1.6m to the side and 4.5m to the rear. Replacement of existing side brick extension. Ground floor rear extension 4m deep with flat roof. Changing windows to aluminium frame double glazed windows. Changing main and adjoining hip roofs to gable roofs. The addition of 10 roof windows. 8 PV collectors laid flat to southern extension flat roof.
3. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the demolition of the garage outbuilding and erection of replacement outbuilding, and the installation of an electronic sliding gate, and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the garage outbuilding and erection of replacement outbuilding, and the installation of an electronic sliding gate at 2 Gibbon Road, Acton, London W3

7AE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 235079HH, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

5. The Council appears to raise no objection to the proposed outbuilding, which is to replace the existing detached garage, and to the installation of a new electronic sliding gate. From the submitted evidence, I have no reason to reach a different opinion on these elements of the appeal scheme. I shall, therefore, focus on the changes sought to the main dwelling.
6. The proposal is primarily to enlarge and alter No 2, which is a 2-storey semi-detached house with a 2-storey side extension. The walls are mainly brick and the roof is tiled with hipped ends. It occupies a prominent corner plot at the junction of Gibbon Road and Bowes Road within a predominantly residential area. Near the site, I saw that pairs of semi-detached houses predominate with some variety in their scale, design and general appearance partly due to various extensions and alterations that have been carried out. As such, there is some variety to the existing built form within the area to which No 2 belongs.
7. The proposed 2-storey side and ground floor rear extensions would be modern in design with clean rectilinear lines, pre-rusted steel-clad walls, flat roofs that vary in height and large feature windows. A section of the new first floor element would also overhang its ground floor counterpart. In my experience, residential extensions that differ in layout and general appearance due to their design, fenestration and materials can positively contribute to the diversity of an area and add visual interest to the street scene to which they belong. Corten steel cladding, as proposed, is a high-quality material and it is not an uncommon feature of buildings in built up areas. Furthermore, the position of No 2 at a transition point between the properties along Gibbon Road and those that address Bowes Road offers an interesting opportunity for a bespoke scheme that could make a definitive architectural statement.
8. However, in this case, the considerable scale and mass of the new built form, coupled with its angular form, overhanging component, and flat roofs would combine to give the appearance of overly large and disorderly 'box like' side and rear additions. The visually strong horizontal lines of the new extensions and those of its windows would accentuate the bulk of the new additions and jar awkwardly with the pattern of fenestration and pitched roof slopes of the main dwelling. To my mind, the extensive use of pre-rusted Corten steel cladding, as proposed, would draw the eye as a discordant feature within an area of predominantly brick buildings. The introduction of 10 roof lights onto the main roof slopes would also be highly repetitive features in a prominent high-level position, that would unduly clutter the roof of the finished development. The main outcome would be significant harm to the visual character of the host building and the surrounding area.
9. This impression would be most pronounced from Bowes Road on the immediate approaches to the site. From these vantage points, the proposal would be obtrusive and appear incongruous even considering the spacious feel within the street scene due to the unusually wide carriageway and when seen among the

varied built form in the local area. While I observed that some properties close to the site include sizeable extensions, including those to which the appellant has referred, none were like the proposal in design, scale or in their relationship to the host building or the surrounding area. Consequently, I attach very limited weight to these examples in support of the appeal because they are not directly comparable with the proposal.

10. On the main issue, I therefore conclude that the proposed extensions and alterations to the dwelling would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. As such, the appeal scheme conflicts with Policies D1 and D4 of The London Plan, and Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document. Together, these policies aim to ensure that development in built areas compliments their building pattern, scale and materials and has a positive visual impact. It is also at odds with the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework, which state that development should be sympathetic to local character and add to the overall quality of the area.
11. In reaching this conclusion, I note that the proposal was refined in the light of an earlier refusal of planning permission and that changes to the main roof and the existing side extension could come forward through the exercise of permitted development rights. Other changes sought such as the replacement windows would have a limited effect on the intrinsic character of the property. Nevertheless, these changes are not severable to the proposed side and rear extensions, which are objectionable for the reasons given.
12. As the proposed outbuilding and new sliding gate on the Bowes Road frontage would be consistent with the character and appearance of the host building and the local area, these parts of the development would comply with the policies cited by the Council. Although the new gate would include Corten steel, it would have a limited frontage to the road and so a modest presence in the streetscape. As these elements of the proposal are clearly separate to the changes proposed to the main dwelling, I can issue a split decision that grants planning permission solely for them.
13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. Since the external materials to be used are specified on the plans, I have not imposed a condition that they match those of the existing building.
14. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed in part and allowed in part.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR

Schedule of conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) That part of the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Refs A0523-T, 543-A10 Revision B, 543-A11 Revision B, 543-A12 Revision B and the Location Plan, which shows the site edged red.