

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2017

by Daniel Hartley BA Hons MTP MBA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 31 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/16/3160917

72 and 74 Tavistock Avenue, Perivale, Middlesex UB6 8AL

- 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 Ebrahimi Mahmood against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 162357HH, dated 19 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a part single storey and a part two storey rear extension to No 72 Tavistock Avenue and a part first floor rear extension to No 74 Tavistock Avenue.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single storey and a part two storey rear extension to No 72 Tavistock Avenue and a part first floor rear extension to No 74 Tavistock Avenue at 72 and 74 Tavistock Avenue, Perivale, Middlesex UB6 8AL, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 162357HH, dated 19 May 2016, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises an end of terrace dwelling (No 74 Tavistock Avenue) and a neighbouring mid terraced dwelling (No 72 Tavistock Avenue). The former end of terraced dwelling has already been extended to the side and rear in the form of a two storey "wrap around" extension.
 4. It is proposed to erect a pitched roofed first floor extension to No 74 Tavistock Avenue (over most of the existing flat roofed single storey rear extension) and to erect a contiguous two storey pitched roofed extension (including a single storey rear extension projecting about 0.795 of metre) at No 72 Tavistock Avenue. The first floor elements of the proposal would be in line with the first floor rear elevation of the existing extension belonging to No 74 Tavistock Avenue. The first floor extensions would have a roof form which would be comparable, in terms of design, to the existing two storey extension at No 74 Tavistock Avenue.
-

5. Given the limited number of existing dwellings which surround the site (the occupiers of such properties have raised no objection to the proposals), the development would not be conspicuous from any of the surrounding streets. The roofs of the first floor extensions would be lower than the main roofs of the dwellings and I am satisfied, notwithstanding that No 74 had already been extended to the side and rear, that the development would be subordinate in scale to the main house. I acknowledge that the other rear extensions in the terrace are single storey in height, but that does not mean that two storey developments are automatically unacceptable.
6. Taking into account the position of the proposed development, I do not consider that it would cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host properties or to the wider terrace of dwellings. In its delegated officer report the Council has raised some concerns about fenestration detailing. However, the window proportions and designs very much reflect what already exists on the rear elevations of the existing dwellings. In overall design terms, the proposals would not cause significant harm to the host dwellings. In addition, I have no reason to disagree with the Council that the extensions would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of any surrounding properties in respect of outlook, light and privacy.
7. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposal would not cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with the design aims of Chapter 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework; Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document 2013; Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 and the Council's Interim "Residential Extensions" Supplementary Planning Document No 4.

Conditions

8. The conditions set out in the accompanying schedule are based on those suggested by the Council. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three year time limit condition. It is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. I have therefore imposed a condition to this effect. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, it is necessary to impose a materials planning condition.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Daniel Hartley

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 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 the following approved drawings: 1:1250 Ordnance Survey Location Plan; Drawing No VC/P1/11/08; Drawing No VC/P1/11/09; Drawing No VC/P1/11/10; VC/P1/11/11; Drawing No VC/P1/11/12; Drawing No VC/P1/11/13 and Drawing No VC/P1/11/14.
- 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in materials to match the existing buildings.