



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 August 2024

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/24/3343434

30 Warwick Road, Ealing W5 3XJ

- 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 Leena Rash against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application reference is 240715HH.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear extension at 30 Warwick Road, Ealing W5 3XJ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 240715HH subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision.

Main issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house within a predominantly residential area wherein buildings vary in size and design. At the rear of No 30 there is a large flat roof dormer on the main roof slope and a ground floor rear addition. Like the appeal property, I saw that several dwellings in the local area, including those on either side of the site, have been enlarged and altered with some that include large rear extensions. Consequently, there is some variety in the existing built form within the area to which No 30 belongs.
4. The proposal is to replace the existing ground floor rear projection with a longer and larger extension. It would be a sizeable addition, spanning almost the full width of the existing dwelling and projecting outwards from the main rear wall by about 7-metres. The depth of the proposal would comfortably exceed the guidelines for this type of extension that I am advised are set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 4: Residential Extensions (SPD 4) and its Housing Design Guidance (HDG).
5. However, in this case, the proposal would replace a sizeable rear extension that, due to its scale and mass has an imposing presence in the rear elevation of No 30. The depth of the existing rear projection that is to be replaced similarly exceeds the guidelines set out in the Council's SPD 4 and the HDG.

6. From the rear garden of the appeal property, the considerable size of the proposed extension would be readily evident. From this vantage point, the visually strong horizontal lines of the new flat roof and large glazed units in the proposed rear façade would accentuate the bulk of the new addition. It could not reasonably be described as subordinate in scale to the original building, which I am advised is expected of rear extensions in SPD 4. However, the existing ground floor extension that is to be replaced has a similar built form and its relationship to the host dwelling could be referred to in the same terms. While the appeal scheme would be larger than its existing counterpart, its visual impact within the rear façade would not be significantly different.
7. The upper sides of the extension would be visible from the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties on each side of the site would give little indication of the overall size of the extension. None of the proposal would be seen from in front of No 30. I saw that the attached property to No 30 has a large flat roof, full width rear addition, albeit shorter than the development sought, as do several others along Warwick Road that are visible from the site. In that varied built context, the development sought would not be an incongruous or dominant feature nor an uncharacteristic addition to the local area.
8. Having regard to all these matters, and considering the use of matching external materials, I consider that the house, once enlarged, would have an acceptable overall appearance. While it would have been enlarged and altered at the rear, the completed building, taken as a whole, would be in keeping with the character and qualities of the existing dwelling and the local area. Given these circumstances, and as both SPD 4 and the HDG both envisage that there will, at times, be exceptions to their guidelines, a conflict with the advice within these documents is insufficient in itself to withhold planning permission.
9. My attention has been drawn to recent decisions to grant planning permission for rear extensions to several properties along Grange Road and Ascott Avenue, with some background details and plans provided. There are, however, significant differences between these cases and the proposal notably in the design and scale of the development and, in some instances, the planning history of the site. As these examples are not directly comparable with the appeal scheme, I am unable to attach more than limited weight to these decisions in support of the appellant's case. In any event, each development should be assessed on its own merits, which I have done.
10. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host building or the local area. As such, it does not conflict with Policies D3 and D4 of The London Plan, Policies 7B and 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document, SPD 4 or the HDG. These policies and guidance seek to ensure that development follows a designed approach; is compatible with the scale and building pattern of the built area; and represents a coherent development of the site.

Conditions

11. 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. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, a condition is imposed to require that the external materials match those of the existing building, as proposed.

Conclusion

12. There are no material considerations that indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons set out above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR

Schedule of conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Refs P24-06.1 Revision B, P24-06.2 Revision B, and P24-06.3 Revision B.
- 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.