
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2019

by P J Staddon BSc, Dip, MBA (Distinction), MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/19/3225222

13c Norwood Road, Southall, London UB2 4EA

- 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 K. Singh against the decision of the London Borough of Ealing Council.
 - The application Ref 183153FUL, dated 3 July 2018, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2018.
 - The development proposed is the 'erection of part first floor side extension and part first floor rear extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with particular regard to outlook and loss of light.

Procedural matter

3. The submitted plans contain some inaccuracies and omissions, notably with regard to existing windows within the property. The submitted elevations show the existing first floor window in the rear elevation to be deeper than is the case and omits to show the existing ground floor window. There is also a window and rooflight on the side elevation of the property that are not recorded on the plans. However, I have made my assessment based on the effect of the extension proposal in the light of the findings of my site inspection.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. No 13c Norwood Road comprises an existing flat within a subdivided semi-detached property. The property is situated on the north side of the road and is set back from the street by several metres, with a hardstanding to the front which includes a bin storage area. The house has accommodation on three levels – lower ground floor, ground floor and first floor. No 13c is a small

- ground floor flat on the side of the building and comprises a bedroom, bathroom and kitchen / living area.
5. No 13 and its other half, No 11, are traditional style gable fronted period dwellings. No 11 retains its original brickwork and detailing, whereas No 13 has been rendered and painted at some point. It has also been extended at the side with a pitched and hipped roof addition which houses flat 13c; this extension is rendered and painted at the front but has a brick wall to its side. There is also a lean-to addition to the front of the 13c flat at lower ground floor level.
 6. The character of the surrounding area is a mix of residential houses and flats, commercial properties, places of worship and a public car park, which is immediately to the east of the appeal property. There is a range of architectural styles and ages of buildings in the area, although Norwood Road and nearby side streets retain a predominance of traditional dwelling houses, typically of 2 storey scale with brick walls and pitched roofs. Norwood Road appears to be a busy and active street.
 7. The appeal proposal seeks to extend the 13c flat upwards adding an additional floor to the side and rear of the property to accommodate a lounge and kitchen. The extension would be flat roofed and the roof height would be at a similar level to the eaves of the hipped roof on the main house. It would include a window in the front facing Norwood Road and two windows in the rear elevation.
 8. The proposed extension's size and its flat roof design would give a crude and boxy appearance, lacking in architectural subtlety. It would be at odds with the traditional character, proportions and integrity of the host property and would detract from it and disrupt the traditional appearance of the pair of semi-detached properties of which it forms a part.
 9. The addition would appear as an incongruent and prominent feature when viewed from Norwood Road and the adjacent public car park, which I noted is used as a pedestrian route connection to Hammond Road. Indeed, the open nature of the adjacent car park means that the uncharacteristic extension would be quite visible in the public domain and would detract from the streetscene.
 10. I have taken into account the appellant's submissions on design, including views on matching materials, the scale of the extension and the effect on the streetscene and local character. However, this has not altered my assessment of the effects on the character and appearance of the area.
 11. On this main issue, I conclude that the appeal scheme would be contrary to policy 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) and policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), which requires the design of new developments to respect local character and make a positive contribution to the public realm. The proposal would also conflict with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) which similarly requires developments to be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Living Conditions

12. The proposed extension would project rearwards from the rear wall of the host property. The appellant's statement of case says that this projection is 'less than 2.5 metres'¹. However, the plans include a calibrated scale bar and this indicates a projection of just over 3 metres and I have assessed the proposal based on these plans. There are ground and first floor windows in the rear elevation of No 13. These openings are about 1 metre away and both windows appear to serve habitable room accommodation.
13. The bulk and proximity of the proposed extension would diminish the outlook from these windows, placing an imposing blank wall in the view of occupiers of this accommodation. There would also be some loss of light and shadowing, notably in the morning, and this would be more pronounced for the occupiers at certain times of year, when the sun is lower in the sky.
14. On this main issue I conclude that the appeal proposal would be likely to harm the living conditions for occupiers of the adjacent accommodation with regard to outlook and loss of light. This means that the proposal conflicts with policy 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013), policy 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019), all of which seek to protect the living conditions of occupiers and ensure a high standard of amenity.

Other Matters

15. I have taken into account the appellant's examples of developments at other locations on Norwood Road and some appeal cases in other places. However, the circumstances are different in each case and I have made my assessment based on the planning merits of the scheme and the submissions before me.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons stated above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P. Staddon

INSPECTOR

¹ Appellant's Statement of case – paragraph 5.12