



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2025

by Mark Caine BSc (Hons) MTPL MRTPI LSRA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/24/3347014

18 Littlejohn Road, Hanwell, Ealing W7 1NS

- 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 Tijen Onder against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 240519HH.
 - The development proposed is described as 'first floor rear extension, single storey side extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024. The content of the revised Framework has been considered but in light of the facts in this case it does not alter my conclusion.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Cuckoo Estate Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a 2-storey hipped roofed property that is at the end of a short terrace of 4 houses, that are located to the edge of the Cuckoo Estate, and within the CA. It is also situated adjacent to an open, green corridor that contains a number of mature trees and provides access to Cuckoo Park, Littlejohn Road and the estate itself. The appeal site thereby sits in a prominent gateway location.
5. The terms of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.
6. The character of the Cuckoo Estate is described in the CA Appraisal (CAA) as 'A surviving interwar London County Council planned estate with many of its original features and its entire original layout intact. It is a fine example of a housing estate from a period in history when modern "luxuries" such as indoor lavatories and hot water were first being introduced'. It goes on to state that the estate was planned in a methodical manner, along the lines of a traditional garden suburb, and thoughtfully designed in the local topography around the Listed Hanwell Community Centre which stands within Cuckoo Park.

7. The residential streets within the CA are also characterised by small terraces and groups of semi-detached two storey houses set back from the street scene behind modest sized front gardens. The CAA highlights that the terraces are of limited length, always balanced and often symmetrical.
8. I therefore consider the significance of the CA, insofar as this appeal is concerned, to derive from the historic planned layout, and architectural form and materials of its buildings, along with the large green core and areas of open space. All of these factors contribute towards its spacious 1930s suburban character.
9. The Cuckoo Estate Conservation Area Management Plan (2007) recognises the harm that could be caused to the CA by unsympathetic, poorly designed extensions and alterations. It states that the proliferation of unsightly and over-scale rear, side or roof extensions and the addition of porches to dwelling houses are all regarded as detrimental to the historic environment of Cuckoo Estate.
10. The Council has not found the proposed side extension to be objectionable and I have no reason to question this. The proposed first floor rear extension would be built above the existing single storey rear extension which would result in the removal of an uncharacteristic monopitch roof and maintain the size of the back garden area. It would also have a lower ridge height than the main dwelling's roof, be constructed in materials to match those found on the original house and be set away from the shared boundary with the adjoining property at No 16.
11. Nonetheless, the proposed rear extension would project around 3.9 metres beyond the rear wall of the original building at first floor level. It would also noticeably jut out from the gable elevation and have a lower eaves line than that found on the original dwelling. These factors would combine to create a large, disjointed and conspicuous addition that would fail to integrate satisfactorily with the existing property. This additional bulk would further diminish the form and designed symmetry of the terrace and the pattern of development in the area, thereby causing harm to the significance and character and appearance of the CA.
12. I appreciate that the proposal is to the rear of the site and that the original dwelling and mature trees may screen and filter longer distance views of it from some directions. However, the discordant effect of the proposal would be clearly visible from the adjacent green corridor and parts of Cuckoo Park.
13. I consider the harm that would be caused to the significance of the CA would be 'less than substantial' within the meaning of the Framework. Paragraphs 212 and 213 of the Framework explain that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset, and that any harm requires clear and convincing justification. Paragraph 215 of the Framework goes on to state that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of such an asset that this harm should be weighed against the proposal's public benefits. However, no public benefits associated with the proposal have been put forward to be weighed against this harm.
14. I therefore find that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the CA. As such, conflict would arise with Policies 7C and 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (December 2013) and Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021).

These seek to deliver good design by respecting visual character and protecting, conserving and, where appropriate, enhancing heritage assets.

Other Matters

15. The proposal would provide space for an additional bedroom and would not affect views of the listed community centre. The appellant's willingness to accept a planning condition for the submission and approval of details of the window design is also noted. However, these factors would not overcome the concerns that I have identified above.
16. The appellant has questioned the weight to be applied to the Council's Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2004) (SPD4). However, I have not been provided with this document and other for it being listed in the relevant planning policies section, I can see no reference to it in the Council's Planning Officer Report. I have therefore not included it in my deliberations.
17. I have also been made aware that there have been no objections from interested parties and that no responses were received from Hanwell and Canals Conservation Area Advisory Panel (East). Nonetheless, this has had no bearing on the outcome of this appeal as I have only had regard to the planning merits of the proposal that is before me

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, having taken account of the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Mark Caine

INSPECTOR