



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2025

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/25/3361965

194A Norwood Road, Southall, UB2 4JT

- 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 Roman Pecyna against the decision of Ealing Council.
 - The application Reference is 244040HH.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front/side extension added to line up with existing porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front/side extension added to line up with existing porch at 194A Norwood Road, Southall, UB2 4JT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 244040HH, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a two-storey mid terrace 1960s home of unremarkable design fronting, and set back a little from, the busy main road. There is a short, staggered, line of these dwellings with varied porch treatments. The wider scene is a varied one with open areas and dwellings, and some commercial premises, of wide-ranging sizes, styles and ages. The locality generally has an interesting streetscene of established character and pleasing appearance; it incorporates some buildings of appreciable traditional qualities.
-

4. The site lies within the Norwood Green Conservation Area (CA). There is a duty imposed by Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requiring decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. Policy 7C of the Council's Development Management Document (2013) (DMD), part of Policy 1.2 of the Council Development Strategy 2026 (DS) and Policy HC1 of the London Plan (LP) reflect this. DMD Policies 7.4 and 7B, DS Policies 1.1 and 1.2 and LP Policies D3 and D4 are also all relevant to the case. Taken together and amongst other matters they seek to secure development which would display good quality harmonious design, complement the host property and its context and protect local distinctiveness.
5. The Council's concerns, in summary, are that this front extension would look incongruous because of siting and design, run contrary to the established development pattern and be visually harmful to the streetscene, the CA and local character generally.
6. However, in my opinion the modest appeal scheme would not detract from the wider visual appeal of the area nor its established character and it would not impinge upon any buildings or spaces of specific interest. It would increase the existing variation of the 1960s terrace frontage but I would not find that objectionable or visually jarring. Ground floor levels already have some variety and the upper floors would remain uniform. Taking its scale and design cues from the existing, relatively innocuous, front porch would be a valid approach to design to my mind. The scheme would form but a small part of the wider view here along the main road and the eye is presently, and would continue to be, drawn more to the open space opposite and the grander buildings nearby. The qualities of the CA would be preserved.
7. Given the foregoing I conclude that the appeal proposal would not be contrary to the aims of Section 72(1) and would not conflict with the development plan policies which I cite in paragraph 4 above. Whilst they cannot cover very eventuality, I have also carefully considered the Ealing Housing Design Guidance (2023), the Norwood Green Conservation Area Management Plan (2007) and the Generic Conservation Area Management Plan (2023) and I conclude that this specific appeal scheme would not conflict with the aesthetic aims of these documents.

Conditions

8. The scheme should have the standard commencement condition. The Council suggests the requirement for materials to match the existing building. I agree this condition would be appropriate in the interests of visual amenity. I also agree that there should be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans; to provide certainty.

Overall conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character or appearance of the host property or the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR