



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/22/3295049

17 Regina Road, West Ealing, W13 9EE

- 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 Raj Gupta against the decision of London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 216560FUL, dated 12 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is conversion of existing rear garage into a studio flat with a single storey side extension and associated alterations to fenestration and external amenity space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for conversion of existing rear garage into a studio flat with a single storey side extension and associated alterations to fenestration and external amenity space at 17 Regina Road, West Ealing, W13 9EE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 216560FUL, dated 12 November 2021, 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: PL-100 Rev A, PL-101 Rev A, PL-102 Rev A, PL-103 Rev A, PL-104 Rev A, PL-105 Rev A and PL-106 Rev A.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials and finishes to be used for the external surfaces of the works hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has provided amended drawings with this appeal responding to the Council's third reason for refusal by showing an internal cycle store. As this is an internal change only, I am satisfied that interested parties would not be prejudiced by my determining this appeal based on these amended plans.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - Whether the proposed development would provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers,
 - The effect on the character and appearance of the area; and,

- Whether it would provide sufficient storage for bicycles.

Reasons

Living conditions

4. The proposal is for a one-bed studio flat with a shower room. The London Plan 2021 (the LP) requires a minimum internal floor area of 37 square metres for such accommodation. The building, including the proposed extension, would meet this requirement. The inclusion of a large window in the front wall of the building, together with the dormer window and kitchen window, would together provide acceptable natural light and outlook to the building.
5. The outdoor amenity space would exceed the minimum requirement of five square metres for a one person dwelling, although it would also serve as a storage area for bins. While hemmed in on each side by high walls and fences, it would provide some outdoor space for occupiers. The provision of a separate entrance door in the front elevation of the building would mean that the space would not also be used for access purposes. The outdoor space would therefore be an acceptable provision for this property.
6. The appeal proposal would therefore provide acceptable living conditions for future occupiers. It would accord with the requirements of Policies 3.5, 7A, 7B and 7D of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document 2013 (the DPD) and Policies D3, D4 and D6 of the LP. These policies require, amongst other criteria, that development must achieve a high standard of amenity for users and provide comfortable and functional layouts which are fit for purpose and meet the needs of Londoners.

Character and appearance

7. The appeal building faces onto Sydney Road, which is characterised by pairs of semi-detached dwellings of very similar appearance and scale. The appeal building differs from this established character but is largely mirrored by the single storey building to the rear of 19 Regina Road, immediately opposite the appeal site.
8. As an established building in the area the appeal building does not appear out of keeping in the wider street scene. The proposed works to the building would not affect its appearance as a subordinate building between the houses on Sydney Road and Regina Road. The addition of a window and door opening directly onto Sydney Road would not be in keeping with the houses on that street, all of which have front gardens. However, it would match the doors and windows in the flank wall of 17 Regina Road, which face onto Sydney Road without separation.
9. The appeal property is in dilapidated condition, and the proposed development would improve its overall appearance. The extension and other proposed works would not result in the building appearing unduly prominent in the street scene. The scale of development would be proportionate to the small size of the plot on which the building stands. Given the small size of the plot, the modest area of external space would not appear out of keeping and would be similar to that provided for the building to the rear of 19 Regina Road.
10. Accordingly, the appeal proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with Policies 7.4 and 7B of

the DPD, Policy 1.2 of the Development Strategy 2026 Adopted April 2012 and Policies D3 and D6 of the LP. These policies require, amongst other criteria, that development enhance local context by delivering buildings that positively respond to local distinctiveness.

Cycle storage

11. The amended plans provided with the appeal show that storage for one bicycle can be accommodated within the proposed dwelling. This would not result in a significant reduction in the space within the unit. The proposed development would therefore accord with LP Policy T5, which seeks the provision of one cycle space for a one person dwelling.

Other Matters

12. I note resident concerns about the lack of off-street parking provided by the development. However, the Council did not refuse permission on this ground. Given that the proposal is for a one-person dwelling in an area with a high public transport accessibility level, I see no reason to disagree with this.

Conditions

13. I have imposed conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the approved plans for the sake of certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring approval of the external materials to be used. This is to ensure that the development will appear acceptable in the street scene.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, the appeal succeeds.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR