



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2025

by **Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/24/3357894

51 Brassie Avenue, Ealing, Acton W3 7DF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Besart and Xhoana Aga against the decision of the London Borough of Ealing Council.
 - The application Ref is 242554HH.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front porch extension; alterations to the front elevation involving modifications and insertion of windows; single storey, part 2 storey side extension; first floor rear extension .
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front porch extension; alterations to the front elevation involving modifications and insertion of windows; single storey, part 2 storey side extension; first floor rear extension at 51 Brassie Avenue, Ealing, Acton W3 7DF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 242554HH, 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: 2023/09/PP02 Rev. B, 2023/09/PP03 Rev. B, 2023/09/PP04 Rev. B, 2023/09/PP05 Rev. B, 2023/09/PP06 Rev. B and 2023/09/PP07 Rev. B.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. Subsequent to Council's decision, the Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) (the Framework). I consider that there have been no major changes relevant to the main issues in this appeal. It will therefore not prejudice any party by making my decision with regard to the revised Framework.
3. As the description of development varies between documents submitted, I have used that from the Council's decision notice, as this is a full and accurate description of the proposal that has also been used by the appellant in their statement.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:

- The character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area; and
- The living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal dwelling is a two storey end of terrace house that forms part of a group of short terraces that surround an open green area that opens onto the street. The appeal dwelling fronts onto the green with a flank elevation that is set further back from the street than the frontage of the neighbouring house at 53 Brassie Avenue (No.53) and its semi-detached pair. The proposed extensions would wrap around the side and first floor rear of the existing dwelling.
6. The proposed first floor rear extension would sit above the existing single storey rear extension. The hipped roof form of the appeal dwelling would be altered and extended, with a crown roof form at the middle to extend over the rear extension, without significantly raising the roof height above existing.
7. At ground level the proposed side extension would be the same depth as the original house and would be approximately 6.2 metres wide at its widest point at the rear of the house but would narrow to approximately 5 metres at the front. This would align the ground floor of the proposed side extension with the front of the neighbouring house at No.53, and the building line of houses that front onto the street on this side. The first floor of the proposed side extension would step in by approximately a metre from the side wall of its ground floor part. A wraparound roof, in a mono-pitch form, would sit above the ground floor of the proposed side extension and a hipped roof form would top the first floor part. This would connect with the side slope of the main house roof approximately 0.5 metres below the height of the proposed crown.
8. The roof pitch, eaves detail and profile of the proposed roof of the proposed extension, reflect those of the existing dwelling. Given the extent of the existing side driveway garden space, the proposal would successfully infill an incongruous step back between the appeal dwelling and No.53. The setting in of the front, rear and sides of the first floor part of the proposed side extension, would result in it having a stepped massing, and would not appear as a dominant addition. As such, it would comply with the design guidance given in the Ealing Council's SPD 4: Residential Extensions (2004).
9. Although the proposal would result in a significantly larger house than existing, the scale, positioning and design elements I have set out above, would not result in it appearing as excessive in scale or result in it having a cramped appearance on the appeal plot. Rather, the proposal would appear as a subordinate addition to the main house that would harmonise and appear coherent with the street frontages to both Brassie Road and the open green.

10. Consequently, I find that proposal would result in no significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part or that of the local area.

Living Conditions

11. The rear of the first floor of the proposed side extension would be windowless. Door openings are however, proposed in the rear of the ground floor of the side extension, with another in the existing ground floor rear extensions. Two windows are proposed in the rear elevation of the proposed first floor side extension, one of which would be to a bathroom and obscure glazed, whilst the other would be significantly offset from the bedroom window in the flank of No.53. Given the step down to the appeal plot from that of No.53 and the offsetting of the first floor window. The proposal would not result in any direct views into this neighbouring property and would consequently not result in any significant loss of privacy.
12. The flank wall to No.53 currently faces onto the side garden/driveway of the appeal dwelling. Given the existing open garden/driveway area on the appeal plot, the proximity of the proposal to windows in that flank elevation would result in an increased sense of enclosure to the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling. However, given the distance to the proposal, this would not be to the extent that it would have an unacceptable overbearing effect resulting in any significant loss of outlook, beyond that to be expected in a developed residential area of this type.
13. For these reasons. I find that the proposal would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling or that of the local area, or to the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers. Consequently, the proposal would accord with Policies 7.4 and 7b of the Ealing Local Plan, Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Section 12 of the Framework, which collectively seek development of high quality design, are sympathetic to local character and achieve a high standard of amenity for adjacent users.
14. Whilst the Council has found that the proposal would be contrary to policy D4 of the London Plan (2021), I have not done so, as this policy does not relate directly to development proposals, but to the Council's adoption of design policy and design management.

Conditions

15. Along with the standard condition relating to the timing of implementation, I have attached conditions to ensure design quality that require compliance with the approved drawings and materials that match existing.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given, and with regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR