



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2025

by N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/25/3362576

269 Brunswick Road, Ealing W5 1AJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Dr Nahid Yousefi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 242795FUL.
 - The development proposed is front porch extension; alteration to front of property involving hard and soft landscaping; alteration to boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the above banner heading has been taken from the decision notice as this accurately and concisely describes the proposed development.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Brunswick Conservation Area (CA); and
 - The effect of the proposed development on the road network's safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site relates to 269 Brunswick Road, a two storey Edwardian style dwellinghouse located on the northern side of Brunswick Road. The dwellings along the road are of a similar design and style. They are primarily characterised by two-storey semidetached dwellinghouses with a canted front bay window. These properties largely feature recessed front doors of two different styles (either brick arches or gabled porches) and appear alternately. The host building has a mock-Tudor style gable porch supported by two timber pillars on brick plinths. Its front door is further recessed from the building's front elevation. The front garden is bound by a small brick wall to the front and sides. The property shares a

driveway with the neighbouring property No 267 Brunswick Road (No 267) located to the west and this driveway already has an existing dropped kerb.

5. As referred to above, the appeal site is located within the CA. I therefore have a duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. I have also had regard to paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which explains that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
6. The CA primarily derives its significance from its relatively consistent historic architectural forms. The appeal site by virtue of its consistent and prominent features positively contributes to the character and appearance of the CA.
7. The proposed development seeks planning permission for amongst other works, a front porch extension. As set out, the current front porch is recessed with two timber pillars supporting a gabled roof. The proposed development would enclose the front porch with frosted glass panels and a door at the front and similar frosted panels over brick plinths on the sides. The design would erode the recessed nature of the existing porch.
8. The Brunswick CA Management Plan, 2007 (CAMP) states that inappropriate porches with neo-classical architectural features are detrimental to the historic setting of the CA. The Generic CA Management Plan, 2023 states that open recess porches that are subsequently enclosed can also have a detrimental impact. The Management Plan further requires porches not to detract from the original appearance and design of the house or disrupt the cohesion of the group.
9. The proposed development would bring the front door forward, significantly diminishing the recessed nature of the porches. This loss of the distinctive appearance of the front door and glazing would be at odds with the established pattern of development in the CA.
10. Whilst some other properties have enclosed their front porch, there still remains a degree of symmetry between properties. Where this has been done, it has primarily been with transparent glass panels whilst retaining the position of the original front doors. This allows the visibility of the original front doors and surrounding glazing, which are considered to be an important original design element. Notwithstanding, I am unaware of other properties planning history and thus this would not alter my findings, nor would their existence justify the scheme as I have considered this scheme based on its own merits.
11. The proposed development would also hard pave the front garden with some vegetation along the eastern boundary and in front of the bay window. The current front and western brick boundary wall are to be demolished with only a very small portion next to the porch retained. ACO drains are proposed along the front and western boundaries and 2 car parking spaces are proposed, formulated by the crossover for the shared driveway in front of No 267.
12. The CAMP states that the removal of existing traditional boundaries and gardens will be resisted and that proposals to replace or develop boundaries or front or side gardens will be appropriate in their materials and of high-quality design that is

compatible with the historic character of the CA. The Generic CA Management Plan, 2023 sets out some principles for hard paving in the front gardens with the aim of preserving historic boundaries and maximising soft landscaping.

13. Whilst several properties have converted their front gardens into parking areas, I am unaware of their planning history and the overall character of the CA is still fairly verdant. There is a clear spatial relationship with retained side and front boundaries and clearly defined front garden areas.
14. Vehicular access would be taken from the existing shared driveway. This would result in an extensive area of hard surfacing across the two properties, lacking any clearly defined boundaries or soft landscaping. The small part of the walls to be retained and surface treatments would not be sufficient to mitigate against this, nor would the proposed landscaping even considering retained trees. This is because there would still be a significant amount of hard surfacing. Given the site's location within the CA, I am not convinced that this should be left to a condition. The site benefits from planning permission for alteration to front of property involving hard and soft landscaping; alteration to boundary wall under reference 222030FUL. From the evidence before me, this consent is extant and thus is a material consideration in respect of the current appeal. I have considered the approved plans as part of that scheme, but the proposed scheme before me is different and comprises larger areas of hardstanding with less landscaping which would result in greater visual harm.
15. For the above reasons, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the CA which would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset.
16. Paragraph 215 of the Framework explains that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. The benefits associated with the scheme are largely to the private benefit of the occupiers by making alterations at their property. I acknowledge that there would be some economic benefits during construction, but this would be limited given the small-scale nature of the proposals. Overall, there are insufficient wider public benefits to offset the identified harm to the CA to which I have attached great weight given the requirements of the Framework.
17. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policies D3, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan, 2021 (LP), Policies 7.4 and 7C of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document, 2013 and the CAMP. Amongst other matters, such policies explain that development proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the assets significance and appreciation within their surroundings.
18. For the same reasons, the proposed development would also be contrary to sections 12 and 16 of the Framework relating to achieving well-designed places and conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Road network

19. As set out, the property already shares a driveway with the neighbouring property, No 267 and this shared driveway already has an existing dropped kerb which would not alter as part of the development. The site also benefits from planning permission for alteration to front of property involving hard and soft landscaping; alteration to boundary wall under reference 222030FUL. The approved plans for that scheme show the existing shared driveway and parking space to the front of the appeal property. On this basis and without any evidence to the contrary, the use of the shared driveway and parking to the front is something that already benefits from planning permission which is extant and thus could be implemented at the site.
20. The overall access/parking arrangements for the current scheme would continue to use the shared driveway and remains largely unchanged from the previous scheme. The proposed development would not therefore result in any greater impact in this regard even considering any walking and cycling experience on the adjacent footway. The previous scheme may have proposed one car parking space opposed to two as per the current scheme although this difference alone would not warrant a refusal to the appeal. I also have no compelling evidence to suggest that two cars cannot be accommodated onsite. I note the Council's concerns regarding the lack of a swept path analysis to demonstrate safe vehicle entry and exit, as well as plans showing the site's capacity to accommodate two on-site parking bays. However, given the existing arrangements and that there is an extant consent in place for similar access and parking, then it would be unreasonable to now prevent the access arrangements as part of the current scheme even if two parking spaces are now proposed. Given the nature of the scheme and the manoeuvre to get onto and off the driveway, vehicles would be going very slow, and the slope onsite would encourage extra vigilance. An appropriately worded planning condition could also be imposed requiring further information relating to parking onsite were I minded to allow the appeal.
21. If vehicles are parked at No 267 and the cross over is occupied, there would be limited manoeuvrability for other vehicles to enter or exit the site. However, I understand that this is a situation which could occur under the extant planning permission. Whilst the removal of the front boundary could potentially encourage illegal crossings, the scheme proposes to use the existing crossover, and I must consider the scheme on this basis. I am aware of concerns regarding ownership but as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, it is not necessary for me to consider this in further detail/pursue this matter further with the main parties.
22. For the reasons given above, I conclude on this issue that the proposed development would not unacceptably harm the road network's safety. It would therefore comply with Policy T4 of the LP which amongst other matters, explains that development proposals should not increase road danger. For the same reasons, the proposed development would comply with section 9 of the Framework relating to promoting sustainable transport. A lack of harm in this regard would not however overcome the other harm that I have identified.

Other Matters

23. I am aware of changes made to the scheme from previous proposals and communications with the Council although this would not alter my findings on the

above main issues. The appellant has also explained that the residents are in need of cars due to mobility issues and challenges faced regarding parking. However, this would not be sufficient to justify harmful development nor would the drainage proposals/permeable materials as part of the scheme or the repairing of the fence.

24. In considering this appeal, I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) set out under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, in particular the need to eliminate discrimination against persons with the protected characteristics of age and/or disability, advancing equality of opportunity for those persons and fostering good relations between them and others. Following careful consideration of the scheme. I am satisfied that the impact of dismissing the appeal is proportionate and necessary.

Conclusion

25. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations, either individually or in combination including the provisions of the Framework, that would outweigh the identified harm and associated plan conflict. I conclude that the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR