



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 11 September 2020

by Rachel Walmsley BSc, MSc, MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/20/3246574
17 North Avenue, Southall UB1 2RE

- 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 Mrs Hajra Khatoon against the decision of London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 194597HH, dated 28 October 2019 was refused by notice dated 24 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is first floor side and rear extension with main roof extending over, and installation of window to existing side elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The description of development on the planning application form didn't accurately describe the development proposed. The appellant acknowledges this and refers to the correction made by the Council. On this basis I have used the description of development provided by the Council in the banner heading above.

Main Issue

3. This is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The area of North Avenue in which the appeal site sits is characterised by short blocks of terraced houses that front the street. The blocks are arranged uniformly with houses at either end of the street giving way to blocks in the centre that are set further back from the highway.
5. The gaps between the blocks are an important feature of this layout, particularly at first floor level where the absence of development creates a visual break between buildings. The fact that the area is not within a conservation area does not lessen the significance of these features and the positive contribution they make to the character of the area overall.
6. The first-floor extension would occupy a gap between buildings and would be visible from the street. Given the absence of development at first floor level within the street, the proposal would appear incongruous and out of keeping

with the street scene. I recognise that the protrusion beyond the existing building line would be modest in size and the set back of the extension from the front elevation of the property would create some subservience. However, this would not mitigate the harm identified as a result of the development encroaching into the visual gap described.

7. Although set down from the ridge line of the host dwelling, the development would extend a notable distance out from the rear of the existing house and would be more than half the width of the existing property. As such, the extension would not be subservient in form or scale to the host dwelling. Although the position of the extension at the rear of the house would mean that views of it would be limited, the form and scale of the proposal would not be sympathetic to or in-keeping with the traditional character and appearance of the dwelling or with the houses either side.
8. The extension at no.19 is a ground floor extension and therefore does not compare reasonably or fairly with the development proposed to be considered a precedent. I have also been referred to planning permissions for double-storey extensions at a property elsewhere within the borough. I have no details of this development and the permissions referred to. And whilst I visited the site, I can draw no parallels between this form and scale of the development and the appeal proposal to give any weight to precedent in this appeal.
9. I have had regard to the personal circumstances of the appellant and the associated need for the development proposed. However, there is nothing within the evidence before me that justifies an extension of the scale and layout proposed. Furthermore, there is no evidence to suggest that alternative layouts have been considered to no avail; it appears from the floor plans before me that a bathroom with direct access to a bedroom could be created at first floor level, without the need for the extension proposed.
10. I have also had regard to the Council's lack of objection to the impact of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. However, this does not compensate for or mitigate the harm to the character and appearance of the area.
11. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. It is therefore contrary to policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan¹ and policies 7.4 and 7B of the Development Plan Document² which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development proposals are of a high standard of design and that the scale and form of development respects or complements local character.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachel Walmsley

INSPECTOR

¹ The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for London, consolidated with alterations since 2011, March 2016

² London Borough of Ealing, Development Management, Development Plan Document, adopted 10 December 2013