



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2022

By A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M5270/D/22/3305520
1496 Greenford Road Greenford UB6 0HP

- 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 Nikita Patel against the decision of The London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref: 221620HH dated 21 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is alteration to roof slope of existing single storey rear extension; construction of partial rear roof terrace at first floor level; construction of front porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alteration to roof slope of existing single storey rear extension; construction of partial rear roof terrace at first floor level; construction of front porch extension at 1496 Greenford Road Greenford UB6 0HP in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 221716HH dated 21 April 2022 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The works authorised by this consent 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 plans: SCL.04, SCL.03, SCL.05, SCL.06, SCL.07.
 - 3) Glazing to the proposed balcony shall be fully obscured to prevent intervisibility with neighbouring users.
 - 4) No part of the flat roof of the extension hereby approved shall be used for sitting out or accessed other than for the purpose of maintenance and repair.

Preliminary Matter

2. Although the description of development refers to a 'roof terrace' what is proposed would have the character of a balcony, and I have used that term within my reasoning to ensure there is no lack of clarity as to what is permitted does not include the use for sitting out of the generality of the flat roof area.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon neighbouring users, and upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site, number 1496 Greenford Road (No.1496) is an extended semi-detached house with a large rear dormer and rear ground floor extension. The proposal intends to alter the sloping roof of the 4m deep extension to a 'flat' surface and provide an enclosed balcony at first floor level with outlook contained by side panels. No.1496 sits within an area of suburban housing where properties have been subject to varying degrees of incremental change which has tended to degrade the character and appearance of the original early to mid-twentieth century suburban housing which fronts Greenford Road. As with its adjoining property, No.1496 has a fully paved forecourt and depleted rear amenity areas lacking planting or other landscape softening. No.1496 and adjoining properties feature single storey outbuildings at the rear boundary which serve to separate the appeal site from terraced housing fronting Gainsborough Gardens which lie to the rear.
5. The Council refers to the visual harm from the addition of the balcony area and the absence of similar development nearby. Whilst that (latter) observation and concern as to the creation of precedent is noted, there is, to my mind, little additional visual harm generated in the specific circumstances of the appeal site due to the accumulation of change to No.1496 and its immediate neighbours. In particular I note the construction of the dormer extension with a Juliet balcony which employs materials not inconsistent with what is proposed.
6. Similarly, although the Council are correct to assert that porches to neighbouring properties have sloping roof surfaces, those porches differ significantly in their form and quality of implementation. Notwithstanding any inconsistency in the architectural approach between what is proposed and the original, now altered, building, I find the proposed well-considered external additions of balcony and porch would cause no additional visual harm.
7. The Council also express concern as to the impact upon (and perceptions of privacy by) neighbouring users. However, as proposed with high side screens the outlook would be restricted to a relatively narrow angle of view in which subjects would more than 20 metres distant. The side screens would prevent any direct overlooking of the adjoining properties if glazing were obscured. Even if there were a degree of intervisibility with neighbouring users, the outlook from the existing roof level bay window and its Juliet balcony, is extensive and commanding. If contained by sidescreens the proposed balcony would not increase the opportunity for overlooking to any measurable degree.
8. On that basis I conclude that the proposed development would not conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Plan DPD (2013) nor, therefore, with the Development Plan taken as a whole. Consequently, taking into account all matters raised, the appeal should succeed subject to the usual conditions as to plans and timing. I consider conditions ensuring the balcony glazing is obscured to prevent overlooking and that flat roof areas outwith the approved balcony are only accessed for the purposes of maintenance and repair are necessary and relevant.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR