

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2022

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/21/3282791

25 Sandringham Road, Northolt UB5 5HN

- 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 Ronald Shillingford against the decision of London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 213668HH, dated 14 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2021.
 - The development proposed was originally described as proposed loft conversion and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - The character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of No 27 Sandringham Road (No 27) with particular reference to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow within a residential area comprising of a mix of house styles and sizes. Although there are some differences between the host property and the attached, the three-dimensional form of the hipped roof creates a balanced form which contributes to the character of the pair of dwellings. The proposed roof alterations would significantly alter this balance.
4. More harmfully though the proposal would result in an awkward arrangement of flat and pitched roof elements and an unbalanced rear gable. The long narrow flat roof feature would jar injuriously with the broken gable resulting in a contrived appearance to the rear. The effects of this would be localised as the extension would be seen to the rear from neighbouring properties and gardens rather than from the street. However, even cumulative, and incremental changes of this kind can erode the character and quality of an area.
5. I have no firm details regarding any potential fallback scheme through permitted development rights. However, I accept that the original balance of the pair of properties has the potential to be disrupted. Nonetheless, the

juxtaposition of elements, as proposed, would still result in a scheme that fails to harmonise with the three-dimensional form of the pair of properties.

6. Several properties in the area have been extended significantly to the rear, including at No 29 Sandringham Road (No 29). I do not have the full details of the circumstances that led to these other extensions so cannot make a direct comparison. In any event, the extension at No 29, shows how the scale and form of an extension can harmfully alter the balance of a pair of properties to the detriment of their character and appearance.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harmfully effect the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore conflict with the requirements of Policies 7B and 7.4 of the Council's Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) (DPD), Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021) (LP), and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). These stipulate, amongst other things, that development should compliment the existing built areas street scene, building pattern, scale, materials, and detailing. The Council's reason for refusal also refers to Policy D5 of the LP. This is concerned with inclusive design and as such has not been determinative in my assessment of this main issue.

Living conditions

8. The proposed roof alterations would result in a considerable bulk of built form near the boundary with No 27. The massing would be stepped back by approximately 1.5m from the common boundary which would moderate the visual effects from the adjoining neighbouring property. However, due to the length of projection and solid massing of its side profile it would be a striking feature. This would create an unduly hemmed in feeling and sense of enclosure from the ground floor rear window closest to the boundary.
9. I accept that due to the length of the garden at No 27, the proposal would not be unduly dominant from all of the garden. I also have no substantive evidence that the proposal would result in the loss of light at No 27. However, this does not overcome or outweigh my concerns regarding the relationship with its nearest window on the rear elevation.
10. I therefore find that the proposal would harmfully effect the living conditions of the occupiers of No 27 with particular reference to outlook. As such, I find conflict with Policies 7B of the DPD, D3 and D5 of the LP and paragraph 30 of the Framework. These broadly seek to ensure good standards of living conditions for existing occupants, amongst other things.
11. The Council's reason for refusal also refers to Policy 7.4 of the DPD which is concerned with local character and Policy D5 of the LP which is concerned with inclusive design. As such, I do not consider these policies to be determinative in my assessment of this main issue.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR