



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2023

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th December 2023

APP/A5270/D/23/3328884

58 Enmore Road, Ealing, Southall, UB1 2PG

- 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 Deol against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 232280HH, dated 7 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is for a part first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part first floor rear extension at 58 Enmore Road, Ealing, Southall, UB1 2PG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 232280HH, dated 7 June 2023, and the plans submitted with it, 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: 01ELF Proposed Location and Block Plan; 01ELF Proposed Plans; and 01ELF Proposed Side Elevation.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) No part of the roof of the two-storey and single storey rear extensions shall be used as or altered to form a balcony, roof garden, roof terrace or similar amenity area.
 - 5) Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any subsequent amendment, revision or new Order) no windows or other openings (other than those shown on the submitted plans) shall be formed in the walls or roof of the hereby permitted extensions.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a 2 storey terraced house near the end of Enmore Road where it meets the boundary fence for Greenford High School. Houses close to the site share common design features which contribute to the character and appearance of the area. They include 2 storey flat roofed bays with a band of hanging clay tiles between the ground and first floor windows and single pitched clay tiled front door canopies. The projecting bays on each end house on nearby terraces have a dual pitched gabled roof projecting from the main roof plane, rather than a flat roof at eaves level. The rear of the appeal site terrace backs on to the High School and Greenford Sports Centre recreation ground. A metal boundary fence and mature trees along the edge of it largely obscure views of the back of houses, most of which have single storey rear extensions and outbuildings that abut the rear fence.
4. Although there are no first floor rear extensions on other houses within the terrace, existing screening would limit views of the proposed development. It would have no impact on the key features that define the character and appearance of the area, described above, which relate to front elevations of houses visible from the street. The proposed development would also generally accord with the requirements of Policy 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) (DMDPD). That policy states that proposals should complement the street sequence and building pattern which refer to the spacing and massing of buildings within the street and their layout and site coverage, both of which would be unaffected by the proposed development. It would be subservient to the main house in terms of its height, depth, and width, and thus of an appropriate scale, and the materials would match those of the main house.
5. I recognise that the detailing would be at odds with other houses within the terrace, but rear views are not available from any nearby roads or houses because of its location next to the recreation ground. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would cause no harm to the character and appearance of the house or wider area and as such would not conflict with The National Planning Policy Framework (2023) and Policies D4 of the London Plan (2021) and 7.4 of the DMDPD which encourages development that complements and is sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

6. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission I have specified the approved plans to provide certainty and imposed a condition regarding materials to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. The Council's suggested conditions preventing windows being added to the extension and alterations to enable the rear roof areas to be used as amenity space are necessary to protect the privacy of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR