



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2019

by D Hilton-Brown BSc (Hons) CIEEM

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/19/3234426

1 St Ursula Road, Southall UB1 2TH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Fredrick Krishan against the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 191970FUL, is dated 29 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is for a new two-bedroom, semi-detached house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed, and planning permission is refused.

Procedural Matters

2. Whilst the Council have not formally determined the planning application, they have given putative reasons for refusal in their appeal statement. From these I consider the main issues in this appeal to be as follows:

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - (i) the effect of the proposed development, by virtue of its design, scale and location on the character and appearance of the immediate area; and
 - (ii) whether the proposed development would provide acceptable living conditions for the future occupants, with particular reference to the provision of outdoor space and cycle parking facilities; and
 - (iii) whether or not the proposed development would contribute to an increase in on-street parking.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is situated in a residential housing estate on the corner of Saint Ursula Road and Cornwall Avenue. The area is characterised by two-storey terraced and semi-detached properties, with the majority being of a similar style and appearance. The site contains a semi-detached two-storey house set within a triangular plot. The proposed development would result in the construction of a two-storey, semi-detached, two-bedroom house attached to 1 Saint Ursula Road.

Character and appearance

5. The terraced houses on both sides of the street within the area of the appeal site are all set back from the rear of the footway. However, the semi-detached corner properties (1 and 2 Saint Ursula Road) sit forward of this line. The addition of a further dwelling in this prominent position on the corner would result in the proposed dwelling being visually dominant and incongruous within the streetscene.
6. Furthermore, the addition of the proposed dwelling would result in the partial closure of the space between the existing dwellings of 1 and 3 Saint Ursula Road, which form part of the original street design. This would result in the loss of the clear delineation between the terraced properties and the semi-detached corner dwellings. The scale and size of the proposed extension would also result in the original semi-detached design taking on a more terraced appearance, which would be out of keeping with the corner plots in the surrounding area.
7. All of these factors lead me to conclude that the proposed development would clearly disrupt the existing pattern of development on Saint Ursula Road, leading to a cramped and over-developed appearance.
8. My attention has been drawn to other similar schemes in the area. However, I have not been provided with the planning details of these developments. Furthermore, their existence does not justify the further harm to the area that I have found would occur if the appeal development were to be allowed.
9. Therefore, this development fails to comply with policies 7.4 and 7B of the DPD, 3.5, 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan¹, 3.5 of the Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)² and the Framework³. Together these policies require development to complement and enhance the local character and streetscape.

Living conditions for future occupiers

10. Table 3.2 of policy 3.4 of the London Plan, sets out a residential density guidance of 150-250 habitable rooms per hectare (hr/ha) for development in this area. The construction of an additional property within the grounds of the host dwelling would lead to a figure of 359 hr/ha. This therefore exceeds the density range as set out in the London Plan.
11. This in turn would lead to inadequate external space for the occupiers and future occupants of both the host and proposed dwellings. Policy 7D of the DPD, typically requires development of this type to provide 50sqm of garden space, which would be in-keeping with the immediate vicinity. Both the host and proposed dwelling would fall below this requirement, by providing approximately 40sqm and 42sqm of external space respectively.
12. I therefore conclude that the development would not provide acceptable living conditions for the future occupiers of the new dwelling. Consequently, it would not comply with policy 7B and 7D of the DPD and policies 3.4, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan. These policies require development to meet the demand for

¹ The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011. March 2016.

² Mayor of London, London Plan 2011, Implementation Framework, Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance, November 2012.

³ Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government, National Planning Policy Framework, February 2019.

open space. The cycle parking provision could be made acceptable by an appropriately worded condition.

Parking provision

13. This development would result in the loss of onsite parking for the host property in an area outside of a Controlled Parking Zone. This would lead to additional pressure for on-street parking in the local area.
14. The appellant states that there would be adequate on-street parking and has referenced a parking survey as evidence. However, this only includes basic plans, with no accompanying methodology or conclusion and is not sufficient to make a positive judgement on this matter. Additionally, the Council had raised concerns over the proposed relocated pavement crossover for the new dwelling. No further information has been submitted to enable resolution of this issue.
15. Therefore, due to insufficient information, I am unable to make a reliable assessment on whether or not this development would be detrimental to on-street parking provision.

Conclusion

16. However, notwithstanding this, for the reasons detailed above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed and planning permission refused.

D Hilton-Brown

INSPECTOR