



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 June 2022

by M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/22/3291804

8A Boston Parade, Boston Road, Hanwell, W7 2DG

- 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 Ms Li Hua Huang against the decision of London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 216523FUL, dated 10 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear extension with Juliet balcony, rear roof extension incorporating a Juliet balcony, and installation of two roof lights to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the decision letter as it is the most accurate description of the appeal proposal.
3. Existing and proposed elevations have only been provided for one side of the building. Had I otherwise been minded to allow the appeal this is something on which I would have sought the further comments of parties. However, as I am dismissing the appeal this has not been necessary.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers; and,
 - The effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living conditions

5. The appeal proposal would significantly increase the depth of the existing first floor rear projection. The proposed extension would be substantially deeper than the rear projections to the neighbouring properties 7 and 9. This additional depth would cause a significant increase in enclosure and loss of outlook from the habitable room in No 7 adjacent to the shared boundary.
6. Only the enclosed patio area of the extension would cross the 45 degree line taken from the rear doors to the projections to Nos 7 and 9. As this section of

the extension would have low walls, it would not harm the outlook from these doors.

7. Nevertheless, the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 7. It would therefore conflict with Policies 7A, 7B and 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document 2013 (the DPD) and Policies D1, D3, D4 and D6 of the London Plan 2021 (the LP). These policies require, amongst other criteria, that development not erode the amenity of surrounding uses and that it deliver appropriate outlook.

Character and appearance

8. The appeal property is one of a terrace of similar properties, each with rear projections of varying scale and size facing Wildberry Close. The proposed first-floor rear extension would be set in from the boundaries with the neighbouring properties and would not be as deep as the ground floor rear projection. While it would be one of the deeper first floor projections along the terrace, there is considerable variety in the range of extensions to these properties. The appeal property is not located immediately next to the junction with Cawdor Crescent, and the extension would not be so large that it would appear unduly prominent along the terrace or in the wider area.
9. The Council has raised no objection to the proposed rear dormer or front roof lights. Given that the dormer would be set down from the ridge of the roof and in from the boundaries with the neighbouring properties, I see no reason to disagree with this.
10. The appeal proposal would not therefore cause unacceptable harm to the character of the area. It would accord with Policies 7A, 7B and 7.4 of the GPD and Policies D1, D3, D4 and D6 of the LP. Taken together the relevant criteria of these policies require that development complement their street sequence and building pattern and respond positively to local distinctiveness.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, the appeal fails.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR