
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 May 2023

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/23/3316656
119 Hill Rise, Greenford, Ealing, UB6 8PF

- 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 Alaa Ghandourah against the decision of Ealing Council.
 - The application Ref 225245HH, dated 14 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is 6 metres single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Reasons

3. 119 Hill Rise is a two storey end of terrace house with a single storey flat roofed rear extension and a flat roofed rear dormer window, both the full width of the house. It is characteristic of the form of development along the street. The land slopes down from east to west and also down away from the rear of the house.
4. I consider that the policies most relevant in this case include D1 and D3 of the London Plan which are strategic policies and relate to all aspects of design and policy 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document 2013 (the DPD) which requires new development to achieve a high standard of amenity for users and adjacent uses through good design.
5. The proposed single storey flat roofed rear extension would replace the existing rear extension and project approximately 6m from the original rear elevation across the full width of the house. Most of the neighbouring properties on this side of the road have extensions similar to that existing at No. 119, projecting approximately 3m from the rear elevation, and one or two longer extensions are visible nearby.
6. I consider that the proposal would appear overbearing when viewed from the neighbouring properties. Although in itself it would not be unduly large, projecting approximately 3m beyond the similar extensions on either side, the difference in levels between the existing floor level and the garden mean that

the extension would be raised above the garden level such that the overall height from ground level to roof of the flank walls on both sides would result in a long, high bulky structure which would dominate the outlook from the rear windows and from the garden patio areas of Nos. 117 and 121. This would be particularly so in the case of No. 121 which is at a lower level than No. 119, despite the slight separation of the two properties provided by the narrow passageway between them.

7. I conclude that the proposal would harm the living conditions of the neighbouring residents contrary to policies D1 and D3 of the London Plan and 7B of the DPD.
8. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR