

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 October 2024

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/24/3351045

32 Laughton Road, Northolt UB5 5LL

- 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 A Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application is Ref. 242585HH.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front and two storey side to rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey front and two storey side to rear extension at 32 Laughton Road, Northolt UB5 5LL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 242585HH, dated 4 July 2024 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development to which this permission relates shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this Decision;
 - 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No. Series 2024246: Plan Nos. PA102; PA103; PA104; PA105; PA109;
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed single storey front extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling; the pair with No. 34. and the Laughton Road street scene.

Reasons

3. The background to the appeal application is that planning permission was granted on 15 August 2024 under reference 241719HH for a '*Single storey rear and side wraparound extension and first floor side to rear extension (following demolition of existing structure) and front porch extension*'. I saw on my visit that this scheme was well under way. The difference between that approval and the development now proposed in this appeal is the projection of the front porch extension.
-

4. However, the projection would align with that of the ground floor front bay window, a relatively modest distance of 0.7m. Furthermore, the porch would have a mono pitched roof sloping back to the two-storey side extension and overall the development would comprise an architecturally well-mannered enlargement of the original dwelling.
5. The eye would be drawn to the recessive form of the two-storey element and in my view the modest projection of the porch combined with its alignment to the bay window would be such as to preclude any perception of poor or inappropriate design. In this respect the appeal scheme would be more proportionate and in keeping than many other frontage extensions in Laughton Road referred to in the grounds of appeal and which I was able to see as part of my site visit.
6. As regards the Council's concern relating to an unbalancing the pair of semis with No. 34, the latter property has itself been significantly extended. And in terms of design quality, even allowing for the Council's objection to the projection I see no compelling reason why there should be a requirement in this case to have visual parity.
7. Overall, I find that there would be no harmful conflict with Policies 7.4 & 7B of the Ealing Development Management DPD 2013; Policies D3, D4 and D6 of the London Plan 2021, or with Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed and Beautiful Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework December 2023. I shall therefore allow the appeal.
8. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is needed for the avoidance of doubt and is in the interests of proper planning. A condition requiring matching external materials will safeguard visual amenity.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR