

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2016

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DMS DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 14th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/16/3155904
57 Delamere Road, Ealing, London W5 3JL

- 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 Hadi Ajina against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 162099HH, dated 9 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is single-storey extension to side and rear of existing dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single-storey extension to side and rear of existing dwellinghouse at 57 Delamere Road, Ealing, London W5 3JL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 162099HH, dated 9 May 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: drawing numbers 1585/10 Rev B, 1585/11 Rev A, 1585/12 Rev B, 1585/13 Rev A, 1585/14 Rev B and 1585/01 location plan.
 - 3) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 57 Delamere Road.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The host property forms part of an inter-war housing development of attractive and spaciouly arranged semi-detached properties. The extension proposed would replace an existing garage/outbuilding and be positioned alongside the side boundary with the adjacent semi-detached house at No 59. The appeal property is positioned where Delamere Road curves round at 90 degrees and the housing layout provides it and the other corner properties comparatively large, wedge-shaped back gardens which back onto a railway line.
-

4. The extension would provide quite a substantial amount of floorspace, providing two double bedrooms, a bathroom and a playroom/utility area, with a narrower section connecting onto the main house and accommodating a shower room. The footprint of the addition would still leave the house with a good size rear garden. The extension would be of a low profile, uncomplicated contemporary design with a simple part mono-pitch, part flat roof and plain rendered walls. It would be set well back from the front wall of the main house where only a relatively narrow elevation would face the street which would be behind a gated car space. The straight-forward, single-storey design proposed would therefore appear subordinate to the main house and would not compete harmfully with its contrasting traditional design so as to be visually incongruous.
5. Whilst providing quite a substantial amount of additional living accommodation the extension has been designed not to detract from the character and appearance of the main house, or that of this open and attractive area of suburban housing. Consequently, the proposal would comply with section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework requiring good design and satisfy policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, policies 1.1 (g) and (h) of the Ealing Development (Core) Strategy (2012), policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Plan (2013) and the Council's interim Supplementary Planning Document 4 regarding residential extensions.

Conditions

6. In addition to the standard time limit for commencement, a condition is necessary, in the interests of certainty, that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. The accommodation could conveniently be adapted to provide an independent dwelling and, as this proposal has not been assessed on this basis and this is not the appellant's intention, a condition is necessary to govern the occupation of the development as accommodation ancillary to No 57.

7. Conclusion

8. For the reasons given I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

Jonathan Price

INSPECTOR