
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2017

by Jonathan Manning BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 24 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/17/3169270
6 Thurston Road, Southall, UB1 2SJ

- 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 Imdad Tahir against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref P/2014/2408, dated 14 May 2014, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is first floor side and rear extension and porch extension (part retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The development description on the application form and the decision notice differ. I consider that the description set out on the latter most accurately reflects the proposal. I have therefore used this in the above banner.
3. I understand that a scheme involving a first floor side and rear extension was permitted by the Council in 2009. However, it appears that what has been built and is currently present at the appeal site does not accord with that permission. There have been two previous appeals relating to the appeal site¹, which were both refused. The previous appeal proposals are both very similar to this scheme and are material considerations that I afford significant weight.

Main Issue

4. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the hosting dwelling and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located on Thurston Road and is sited on the corner where it meets Durdans Road. The appeal site accommodates a two storey property that has been extended to the side and rear, which has provided a self-contained annex, with its own front door, although I observed on my visit that internal access can be gained into the annex from the host dwelling. The immediate surrounding area is largely residential and is largely characterised by two-storey terraced properties.

¹ APP/A5270/D/12/2184744, dated 18 December 2012 and APP/A5270/A/13/2203519, dated 31 March 2014.

6. The proposal seeks to retain the first floor side and rear extensions with modifications to its existing appearance. The side extension immediately adjacent to the host dwelling appears as a logical linear extension that mirrors that which exists at the opposite end of the terrace, when viewed from the front of the property. However to the rear, the extension has a very awkwardly angled infill side elevation and overall appears as an overly bulky addition, which does not sit well against the host dwelling's built form and character. Despite the views of the appellant, I observed that the angled infill side elevation and the overall bulk of the rear extension is highly visible from the street scene, namely from Durdans Road.
7. I acknowledge that the existing flat roof of the extension would be replaced with a dummy pitched roof, which has been raised in height from that proposed in the previous appeal scheme² and would sit below the ridge of the original roof. Whilst I accept this would improve the current appearance of the flat roof, it does not overcome my concerns with regard to the contrived and awkwardly angled infill side elevation or the overall bulk of the rear extension, which would remain. The Inspectors of both the previous appeals raised significant concerns about the awkwardly angled infill side elevation. I consider that this adds weight to my findings.
8. For the reasons set out above, I consider that the proposal by virtue of its siting, design and bulk would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. The scheme does not therefore comply with Policies 1.1 'Spatial Vision for Ealing 2026' and 1.2 'Delivery of the Vision for Ealing 2026' of the Ealing Development Core Strategy (2012), Policies 7.4 'Local Character' and 7B 'Design Amenity' of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) and Policies 7.4 'Local Character' and 7.6 'Architecture' of the London Plan (2015). I also consider that the proposal conflicts with Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework that requires good design.

Other matters

9. The appellant has provided undisputed evidence that his disabled son needs support on a daily basis. I understand that the appellant's son and family live at the appeal site to benefit from family support. Whilst this position is noted, I consider that there is no compelling evidence before me to suggest that the needs of the appellant's son and family could not be met by other solutions. As a result, I am not of the view that this matter outweighs the identified harm and the associated development plan conflict.
10. The appellant has referred to another appeal decision³. However, it is unclear to me from the appellant's evidence how the proposal in that case is comparable or indeed relevant to this scheme. Particularly, as the other appeal scheme is located in Southend-on-Sea, Essex and would no doubt have had a different context in terms of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. I therefore afford it little to no weight.
11. Interested parties have raised several other concerns. However, I am dismissing the appeal on other grounds and therefore such matters do not

² APP/A5270/A/13/2203519, dated 31 March 2014.

³ APP/D1590/D/15/3003680, dated 23 April 2015.

affect my overall conclusion. Consequently, such other matters have not had a significant bearing on my decision.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the proposal conflicts with the development plan when taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that individually or in combination outweigh this conflict. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Jonathan Manning

INSPECTOR