



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2019 by Mariam Noorgat BSc (Hons)

Decision by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/19/3230057

23 Palgrave Avenue, Southall, UB1 2LX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Manilal Sivanandan against the decision of Ealing Council.
 - The application Ref 190171HH, is dated 10 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2019.
 - The proposed development is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area; and
 - The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 25 Palgrave Avenue, with particular regard to daylight, sunlight and outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property forms the right-hand half of a pair of two-storey semi-detached houses and includes a large extension to the rear. The area is strongly characterised by semi-detached dwellings or houses in short terraces which are traditional in their form. Most of the semi-detached properties or end terrace properties along Palgrave Avenue include prominent gaps at first floor level, which provides a sense of uniformity.
5. The front part of the proposed development would incorporate an unusual cantilevered first floor. This does not follow the same style of the existing dwelling or wider vicinity.

6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document for Residential Extensions (SPD4) generally outlines that roof details for two-storey side extensions should have the same pitch as the main roof and the same eaves details and profile. Although the proposed development incorporates the same roof pitch angle and eaves level of the existing roof, it differs in form due to the numerous set backs on the front elevation. This would give a perception of a proliferation of extensions at first floor level. As such, this feature, combined with the cantilevered design, would be an incongruous addition that would be detrimental to the street scene when viewed from Palgrave Avenue.
7. The siting of the two-storey extension would be close to the boundary of No.25 and although there would still be a gap between the properties, when walking from the north to south on the eastern side of Palgrave Avenue, this gap would be diminished which would be contrary to the uniformity of the street scene as described above.
8. The first-floor element of the proposed development goes beyond the original rear building line at this level which is an uncommon feature locally. This combined with the ground floor element of the proposal which would go beyond the existing ground floor extension, amounts to a development which would appear bulky and disproportionate to the original dwelling, the pair of semi-detached houses and be incongruous in the wider area.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. I therefore find conflict with SPD4, Policy 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management Document, 10th December 2013, (the Development Plan) and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan, March 2016, (the London Plan) which generally seek to ensure developments are well designed and complement the local character. This is further echoed in Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2019.

Living Conditions

10. The proposal would go beyond the ground floor rear extension and significantly beyond the existing first-floor of No. 25. At one section, the proposed development is very close to the boundary it shares with No.25. The flank wall of the proposed development, due to its height and position, would be very close to and prominent when seen from the two first-floor windows of No. 25, one of which appeared to be a habitable room. The development would therefore be overbearing and would have a negative impact on the light received by these windows and the outlook from them.
11. Also due to the siting of the proposed development, as described above, the development would most likely have an effect on sunlight received at the rear of No. 25 due to its position to the south of this neighbouring property combined with its large scale and height.
12. I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the outlook from and the sunlight received by No. 25, which would adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers. It therefore would be contrary to SPD4, Policy 7B of the Development Plan and Policy 7.6 of the London Plan which generally seek to ensure developments protect neighbouring amenity.

Other Matters

13. The appellant states the existing garage has a larger footprint than the proposed development. However, the proposal, by virtue of its two-storey nature would have a greater bulk and visual impact in the street scene in comparison to the garage.
14. Whilst I sympathise with the appellant's reasons for the proposed development with regards to parking, this would not outweigh the harm the development presents.
15. I understand the appellant is willing to undertake changes to the proposed development to meet the Council's requirements, however, I can only consider the appeal based on the drawings before me.

Recommendation and Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mariam Noorgat

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR