



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 27 February 2025

by K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th March 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/A5270/D/24/3347891

1 Tudor Way, Acton, Ealing W3 9AG

- 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 & Mrs Rawley against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 234686HH.
 - The development proposed is for a rear single storey extension. Rebuild of the existing outbuilding as a two storey structure for use as a home office studio and workshop.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/A5270/D/24/3347887

1 Tudor Way, Acton, Ealing W3 9AG

- 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 & Mrs Rawley against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 234681HH.
 - The development proposed is for 'A rear single storey extension and the rebuild of the existing outbuilding for use as a home office studio and workshop.'
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A Ref: APP/A5270/D/24/3347891 is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear single storey extension. Rebuild of the existing outbuilding as a two storey structure for use as a home office studio and workshop at 1 Tudor Way, Acton, Ealing W3 9AG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 234686HH, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.
2. Appeal B Ref: APP/A5270/D/24/3347887 is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear single storey extension and the rebuild of the existing outbuilding for use as a home office studio and workshop at 1 Tudor Way, Acton, Ealing W3 9AG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 234681HH, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

3. The descriptions of development in the headings above have been taken from the planning application forms. However, in Part E of both appeal forms it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the description on the original application forms.
4. Appeal A and Appeal B relate to the same site. Both proposals are for extensions but differ in size and appearance. Whilst I have considered each proposal on its

own merits, I have dealt with them within a single document, given their similarities, and in the interests of brevity.

5. The Council has not provided the relevant development plan policies, or supplementary planning documents. However, the Council and the appellants have largely set these out in their statement and I have been able to view the relevant online versions where they have been referred to.

Main Issues

6. The main issue in respect of both appeals is the effect of the proposal on the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

7. The appeal site comprises a left hand side substantial semi-detached property at 1 Tudor Way. It is located in a residential area, comprising similar homes which have large, but subservient outbuildings to the side and rear. There is a pleasing overall cohesiveness resulting from the layout, scale and appearance of the homes and the spaces afforded between the majority of the properties from Tudor Way. However there are variations in the character of the area towards the junction of Gunnersbury Avenue. For example, the appeal property is situated adjacent to an individual contemporary dwelling. As such the appeal property is in a more unique position than the majority of homes on Tudor Way.
8. The proposals are similar in that they both seek to extend the existing hipped roof garage building. In both schemes the garage would have a pitched roof and gabled front. They would both be linked by a small single storey off-shoot, with a differing roof pitch, which would be attached to the main dwelling. The main differences between Appeal A and Appeal B is the overall height. The scheme subject of Appeal A is higher. The apex of the altered garage would be below the eaves of the main house. This is in comparison to Appeal B wherein the apex would nearly be below the first floor windows. The additional height of the scheme in Appeal A facilitates a first floor and large windows on the front and rear of the altered garage. The proposed single storey link is very similar in scale and appearance in both schemes.
9. The host building, and the adjacent contemporary property at 1A Tudor Way are both set well forward of the existing garage which is to be altered. As such the garage is not prominent in the streetscene, and not overly visible in views other than directly opposite it. The appeal proposal would not change this characteristic. The lengthy elongated length and increased height of both schemes would be largely concealed from the streetscene by the large two-storey properties at Nos 1 and 1A.
10. The overall form of the altered garage on both appeal schemes are largely and satisfactorily reflective of the front steep gable feature which exists on the host property and on similar dwellings on Tudor Way. The increased height on both schemes would still result in development that is relatively slim and lower than the host building. The main house at No 1 would remain the dominant building, and the garage and its altered features would still appear as a subsidiary element for both schemes.

11. Furthermore, the proposed link and the resultant various roof forms, satisfactorily reorder the contrasting components that currently exist on site. These are already in a similar position to the proposed link and differing in appearance to the host building. Whilst the existing structures are not joined to the existing garage, there is already minimal space between them and very little perception that they are not. As such the joining of the separate elements is not a large contrast from the current situation.
12. Spatially, both proposals result in larger forms of development than currently exists. They would uncharacteristically take up a significant portion of open space along the length of the garden and in views of the streetscene. However, the unique position of the appeal site next to the large outbuildings at the rear of properties on Gunnersbury Avenue mitigate the visual effects of the development. The main visible aspects of both proposals would be of a sloping pitched roof along the side the boundary of the appeal property.
13. In addition although the proposals would be visible from surrounding properties, the resultant development would not stand in isolation from surrounding built development or be significantly contrasting to the current situation. The reduction in space above the garage would not be meaningful in the street scene given the set back of this building and because the height of both schemes would be lower than the host dwelling. I therefore find the conflict with the Ealing Housing Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (online version), which seeks to limit the extent of rear extensions not to be a consideration which is overriding in either appeal.
14. I conclude that the proposals would not harm the host dwelling or the character and appearance of the area. Appeal A and Appeal B would both be in accordance with Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (December 2013) online version. The proposal would also accord with Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan of the London Plan (March 2021) online version. Together, insofar as they are relevant to the appeals, these relate to matters of good design and for development to be appropriate to its context. For similar reasons I find no conflict with the Ealing's Local Plan (Regulation 19) (2024) Policy DAA.

Conditions

15. The Council has indicated that standard conditions should be imposed. These relate to implementation, ensuring development is constructed in accordance with the approved plans and matching materials as specified on the application forms. These are necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of visual amenity.

Conclusion

16. The proposed development would be in accordance with the development plan. There are no other material considerations to indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. I therefore conclude the appeals should be allowed.

K Williams

INSPECTOR

Conditions Schedule:

Schedule Appeal A Ref: APP/A5270/D/24/3347891

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawings: Site Location Plan; 1-Tdr.Wy/Extg.10; Proposed Layouts 1-Tdr.Wy/Prop.30; Proposed Layouts 1-Tdr.Wy/Prop.31; and Proposed Layouts 1-Tdr.Wy/Prop.32.
- 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

End of Schedule Appeal A

Schedule Appeal B Ref: APP/A5270/D/24/3347887

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawings: Location Plan ID: CM-01136980; Proposed Layouts 1-Tdr.Wy/Prop.20; Proposed Layouts 1-Tdr.Wy/Prop.21; and Proposed Layouts 1-Tdr.Wy/Prop.22.
- 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

End of Schedule Appeal B

Appendix 1

List of those who have appealed

Reference	Case Reference	Appellant
Appeal A	APP/A5270/D/24/3347891	Mr & Mrs Rawley
Appeal B	APP/A5270/D/24/3347887	Mr & Mrs Rawley