



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025 by M Long BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/25/3361162

87 Oaklands Road, Hanwell, Ealing W7 2DT

- 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 Michael Beattie against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 244648HH.
 - The development is described as 'Proposed Single Storey Side/Rear Extension, First Floor Side Extension and New Outbuilding'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. During my site visit, I observed that works were being undertaken to the appeal dwelling, however it was unclear whether they related to the proposal before me. In any case, I have assessed the appeal scheme on its own merits based on the proposed drawings.
4. Notwithstanding the description of development in the application form, which is set out within the appeal banner heading and refers to a first-floor side extension, it is clear from the proposed plans that the first-floor element of the proposal actually relates to a two-storey extension to the rear. Indeed, the Council's substantive concerns relate to the two-storey rear extension. I have defined the main issue on this basis.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the two-storey rear extension on the character and appearance of the area, which includes the nearby part of the Hanwell Cemeteries Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal dwelling and its attached neighbour at 89 Oaklands Road (No 89) form a semi-detached pair characterised by a largely symmetrical design. To the rear, the pair have adjoining two-storey outriggers with a dividing chimney breast and mono-pitched roofs that together form a balanced gable shape. Many of the

surrounding semi-detached pairs on this side of Oaklands Road have similar traditional outriggers, which results in a distinctive and ordered pattern. There are alterations to some of the outriggers in the area, including for example at 83 and 85 Oaklands Road which differ in design, and there are also some limited examples nearby of interventions at roof level such as dormers. However, the prevailing consistency of the paired outrigger designs positively contributes to the traditional character of local housing.

7. The two-storey rear extension to the outrigger would sit awkwardly alongside the outrigger at No 89. Firstly, the extended mono-pitched roof, would partly obscure the dividing chimney breast feature and so would not mirror the neighbouring roof. There would also be other uncharacteristic features, namely a tall flank elevation facing the boundary with No 89 and wide bi-fold doors to the ground floor rear elevation. Consequently, the two-storey outrigger would appear both deeper and wider than its neighbouring counterpart and this would unacceptably erode the symmetry and traditional character of the semi-detached pair. This would be appreciable from the neighbouring gardens where it would be viewed as disruptive to the overriding pattern of balanced outrigger pairs in the area.
8. Even though external materials that match the host dwelling would be utilised, this would not integrate the discordant form and appearance of the two-storey extension. I acknowledge that there are some large extensions to nearby properties, including at roof level. The full history of those particular cases is not before me and so I cannot be certain of the circumstances in which they may have received planning permission. Nevertheless, given the prevailing consistency of the original pairings of outriggers, the examples provided do not justify a development that would be at odds with the originality and traditional local character of these dwellings.
9. The nearby CA largely derives significance from its interesting exemplars of Victorian garden cemeteries. The rears of the appeal dwelling and neighbouring houses to this side of Oaklands Road are visible from the CA. Due to its scale and the intervening distance between the extension and the CA, it would not result in any tangible harm to the setting of the CA or the features from which it derives its significance. Even so, the proposal's unsympathetic design would be perceptible from the CA, and it would also be seen to detract from the quality of the townscape from there.
10. I conclude that the two-storey rear extension would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policy 7.4 (Ealing Local Variation – Local Character) of the Ealing Development Management: Development Plan Document (2013) which requires that development in Ealing's existing built areas should complement their building pattern and scale. It would also conflict with Policy D3 (Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach) of The London Plan (2021) (TLP) which seeks development that responds to the existing character of a place. There would be additional conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure developments are sympathetic to local character.
11. The Council have cited conflict with Policy D4 (Delivering good design) of TLP, which primarily relates to the design process and scrutiny rather than specific design requirements for character and appearance considerations, and so has not been decisive in relation to this appeal. Even so, this does not overcome the conflict with the other identified policies of the development plan.

Other Matter

12. Although there have been no substantive concerns raised with regard to living conditions and no third-party objections, this in itself does not mitigate the harm identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Long

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR