
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2020

by E Maund BA (Hons) MSc Dip UP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/19/3242564

10 Waxlow Crescent, Southall UB1 2ST

- 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 Angesh Pandey against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 192901HH, dated 01 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'A House holder Planning Permission to have 6m Rear Extension to accommodate additional area for house owner'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council, in its officer report, refer to adverse impact upon the living conditions of residents due to the limited garden space, I have little evidence to disagree with the Council's assessment in this regard, and therefore confine my decision to the main issue as defined below.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed extension by reason of its depth, site coverage and resultant loss of garden space on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a mid-terraced property on the south side of Waxlow Crescent a narrow street dominated by frontage parking, giving the impression of a compact and closely-knit area.
5. Many of the properties on this side of Waxlow Crescent have had single storey rear extensions and additional outbuildings across the end of the back gardens creating a sense of enclosure, meaning that the modest garden spaces that remain make an important contribution to the character of the area.
6. The main parties are not in agreement over the size of the appeal site and the appellant has questioned whether the Council took into account the space to the front of the dwelling. From my site visit this was laid out as two parking spaces, as such does not provide for useable private garden space.

7. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area is a matter of judgement and does not require a specific percentage of space to be available relative to the size of plot. Whichever figure were to be used, would not change the judgement on the degree of effect from the proposed extension.
8. The proposed extension would be 6m in depth and go across the rear of the property being set in slightly from the shared side boundaries, this in combination with the existing outbuilding which extends the full width of the garden would leave a limited amount of private garden space.
9. The extension due to its significant depth and degree of site coverage and resultant loss of garden space relative to its surroundings, would not thereby respect the local pattern of development. It would appear incongruous and so impact adversely on the general character of the area.
10. This would result in a cramped layout and loss of garden space adversely affecting the character and appearance of the area contrary to the London Plan (2016) Policies 7.4 and 7.6 policy 7B of the Ealing Development Management Plan DPD (2013) and the general objectives of the Residential Extensions SPD which aim to respect the pattern, grain and scale of development.
11. Policy 7D of the DPD relates to the provision of open space from new development and I do not consider this is relevant to the main issue raised by this appeal.

Other matters

12. The appellant also refers to an extension at No 14 Waxlow Crescent, which the Council describe as a prior approval rather than a planning application. I do not have the full details of this scheme before me but was able to see that being an end of terrace the plot size is wider than that of the appeal site. I do not consider this to be entirely comparable to the proposal before me and in any event each proposal must be considered on its own merits.

Conclusions

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

Edwin Maund

INSPECTOR