



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2020

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11/11/2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/20/3253213

9 Mount Pleasant Road, Ealing, London, W5 1SG

- 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 & Mrs J & R Odedra against the decision of the Council to the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 200791HH, dated 22 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as demolition of existing ground floor rear and lower ground rear extension. Proposed new ground floor rear and lower ground rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing ground floor rear and lower ground rear extension. Proposed new ground floor rear and lower ground rear extension at 9 Mount Pleasant Road, Ealing, London, W5 1SG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 200791HH, dated 24 February 2020, 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: 1889AL02P, 1889AL03P and revised drawing 1889AL01-P.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the walls of the rear extension hereby permitted shall match those of the host dwelling, as indicated on drawing 1889AL02P.

Preliminary matter

2. The appellant submitted a revised version of drawing reference 1889AL01-P on 2 November 2020, because the location plan originally submitted with the appeal documents identified the wrong property. As this was a drafting error and the correct address is stated on all other relevant documents, the revised drawing reference 1889AL01-P, can be accepted without prejudice to the Council or any third parties.

Main Issues

1. The first main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the local area. The second main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of adjoining property, with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance

2. Mount Pleasant Road and the local area is characterised by a mixture of traditional two storey semi-detached pitched roof houses and modern flat/shallow pitched roofed three storey terraced houses. The area includes a variety of pitched and flat roofed garages and rear extensions of various depths, heights and designs. The dwellings on the west side of the road have elevated rear ground floor levels and associated raised extensions and terraces, which reflect the sloping topography of the area. They also have deep, mature landscaped rear gardens, which are enclosed by tall fences and planting.
3. The appeal property comprises a pitched roof semi-detached house, with red brick, rendered and tile hung walls. The dwelling includes two attached and elevated single storey rear extensions with a raised patio to the front of them. One of the extensions has a split height glazed roof and the other has a shallow pitched tiled roof. Together the extensions appear disjointed and the whole of the rear of the property appears cluttered and unsightly. It detracts from the simple lines of the host dwelling and the pair of semi-detached dwellings.
4. The adjoining dwelling at No.8, the adjacent dwelling at No.10 and a number of dwellings along this stretch of Mount Pleasant Road have flat/almost flat roofed rear extensions of various heights and depths that are visually uncluttered. They also have raised terraces/patios that are enclosed by a combination of high fences and the flank walls of existing rear extensions. A good proportion of the dwellings also have large rear dormer extensions which accentuate the height and angular lines of the dwellings.
5. Together and amongst other things policy 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document 2013 (DMD) and policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan 2016 (London Plan), require new development to have regard to the form, function and structure of an area. Development should be of the highest architectural quality and respect the scale, mass and orientation of surrounding buildings and compliment the local architectural character. The National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (Framework), similarly states that new development should be sympathetic to local character, be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and add to the overall quality of the area, whilst optimising the potential of the site.
6. Due to its full width and clean vertical and horizontal lines the proposed extension would respect the uncluttered form and design of the original dwelling. The rendered walls at ground floor level would match those of the host dwelling and neighbouring dwellings and the flat roof would be hidden behind a low parapet wall. The height of this parapet wall would be similar to other rear extension roofs within the immediate area. The proposed patio and the use of brick below ground floor level would provide an appropriate visual break between the ground floor and the semi-basement.

7. As a result of these factors the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the host property, the pair of dwellings and would be vastly superior to the existing ad-hoc cluttered of extensions, semi-basement, patio and steps.
8. Although the proposed extension would be deeper than the rear extensions at Nos.8 & 10, as stated above the depth and height of rear extensions in the locality varies and the proposed extension would be readily assimilated into this rear garden environment.
9. I conclude on the first main issue that the proposal would respect and compliment the character and appearance of the host property and the local area. It would therefore comply with policies 7.4 of the DMD, policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan 2016 and the Framework.

Living conditions

10. The Council, in its officer report, refers to the adjoining property as being No.11. It is assumed that this is an error as the adjoining dwelling is No.8 and the adjacent property to the north is No.10. In my assessment I have taken into account the effect of the proposal on the occupiers of both No.8 and No.10.
11. The proposed extension would be similar in height to the extension at No.8, although it would be materially deeper and the raised fence line would be extended slightly further into the rear garden area. As a result, it would be clearly visible from the rear facing ground floor windows and raised patio at No.8.
12. Notwithstanding this, the dwelling at No.8 is located to the south of the appeal property and its rear extension and patio are elevated, providing open and expansive westerly views over its deep rear garden and the rear garden environment as a whole.
13. The dwelling at No.10 is located some two metres from the Appeal dwelling and there is a tall fence along the boundary between the two properties. There is also a brick built outbuilding and some tall shrubs within the garden at No.10, in close proximity to where the proposed extension would be located. These separate the flat roofed rear extension and raised patio at No.10 from the appeal property.
14. The flank wall of the proposed extension would be visible between the existing planting and over the outbuilding roof, from the rear windows and raised patio and rear garden at No.10. The extension would also result in some loss of sunlight and an increased sense of enclosure within the adjacent ground floor rear facing room at No.10. However, this impact would be minimal due to the elevated nature of the ground floor at No.10; the screening that would be provided by the existing boundary fence, outbuilding and planting; and the open and expansive westerly aspect from the rear rooms and garden at No.10.
15. As a consequence, the proposal would not have an unduly enclosing impact on the rear outlook from No.8 or No.10 and the occupants of those properties would continue to enjoy spacious and open outlooks.
16. I conclude on the second main issue that the proposal would not have a materially adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.8 or

No.10, with particular regard to visual impact, daylight or sunlight. Accordingly, the scheme would comply with policy 7B of the DPD which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that new development achieves a high standard of amenity for adjacent users in relation to visual impact and good levels of daylight and sunlight.

Other matters

17. Any concerns relating to the handling of the appeal application by the Council would need to be taken up with the local authority direct, as they are not material to the merits of the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

18. Having regard to the conclusions on both main issues the appeal is allowed.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR