



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 March 2023

by Kim Langford Tejrar LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/23/3315692
62 Bellevue Road, London W13 8DE

- 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 Brian Burns against the decision of London Borough of Ealing Council.
 - The application Ref 223957HH, dated 13 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is 'Single storey rear extension'.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The description of development was changed following submission of the application. I have utilised the amended description for the purposes of the appeal.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the '*Single storey rear extension*' at 62 Bellevue Road, London W13 8DE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 223957HH, dated 13 September 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - a) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - b) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans; Proposed Drawings KTD.02., Proposed Elevations KTD.03.; and Block Plan KTD.99.
 - c) Notwithstanding condition b) above, the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in materials matching the existing dwelling.
 - d) No part of the extension shall be used as or altered to form a veranda, balcony, raised platform, roof garden, roof terrace or similar amenity area.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a mid-terrace two storey house fronting Bellevue Road and bounding Pitshanger Park to the rear. Whilst the terrace backs on to the park, only first floor and roof profiles are particularly visible within the public domain due to a mature evergreen hedge which screens the entire rear amenity spaces of the terrace from the park. The host dwelling is of modest proportions and has not been extended by way of a roof extension, unlike neighbouring properties. The dwelling has an existing, shallow rear extension with a lean-to roof.
5. The appeal scheme proposes to further extend the rear ground floor of the dwelling. Its narrow flat roof element and lean-to roof slope elements reduce the appearance of its mass and its relatively modest depth would be proportionate to the existing dwelling and the scale of the terrace as a whole.
6. Moreover, the modest proportions of the existing dwelling are somewhat discordant with the larger roof and single or two-storey rear extensions in the vicinity; thereby dwarfing it in comparison to much of the rest of the terrace. Whilst its existing rear extension aligns with that of neighbouring properties and the proposed addition would extend beyond, the proposed extension would better reflect the amount and scale of built form at nearby properties. As such, it would be in keeping with the character of surrounding built form. In any case, the extension would be screened from the public domain by a thick and high mature evergreen hedge which bounds the rear gardens of the entire terrace, limiting visibility of the ground floor of the terrace from the park.
7. The rear garden of the appeal site is modest in size, particularly depth. The depth of rear gardens along Bellevue Road varies, and as such, the appeal scheme would result in more built form plot coverage than some other dwellings along the road; including in some of the examples cited by the Appellant. However, the overall grain of development in the area is very tight and regular, and the appeal scheme would not be out of keeping with this.
8. For these reasons, the appeal scheme would integrate with the host dwelling and respect local character in accordance with policies D3, D4 and D5 of the London Plan, adopted 2021, and policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Plan DPD, adopted 2013, as well as the Planning Policy Framework and relevant supplementary planning documents. These policies seek, amongst other things, high quality development which complements an area's character.

Other Considerations

9. The appeal site benefits from an extant permission for a similar rear extension, with a slightly shallower depth (approximately 1 metre). This provides a 'fallback' position, albeit the scheme is not directly comparable to the appeal scheme. It nonetheless is a material consideration for the appeal. Given that I have concluded the appeal scheme accords with the relevant policies of the development plan in its own right, the 'fallback scheme' does not further justify the scheme.

Conditions

10. The Council has requested total of four conditions. I consider it necessary and reasonable to impose conditions requiring that the development take place in a timely manner, in accordance with the approved plans and with matching

materials to integrate it with the host dwelling character of the area. The Council has also requested a condition which would prevent the roof area from being used as a balcony or similar amenity space; I consider this to be necessary in order to prevent any unacceptable impact on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, the appeal scheme would accord with the relevant policies of the development plan and no material considerations indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is accordingly allowed.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR