



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2021 by Ms S Maur

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/21/3278921

Site Address: 55 Jordan Road, Perivale UB6 7BX

- 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 Walid Nassarallah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 213427HH, dated 2 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a second storey over the current single storey rear 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 Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the second storey rear extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The host dwelling is a semi-detached corner property which has already been significantly extended to the rear at ground floor level. This extension projects beyond the original side wall of the dwelling. The corner plot location is such that views of the front, side and rear of the dwelling are prominent. The property lies within a residential setting and extensions are present on a number of properties in the area. Side extensions are typically set to the side of the original dwelling, some with a modest set back from the front wall.
5. The proposal is for a second storey rear extension that would attach to the rear ground floor extension and continue to project to the side of the main flank wall, retaining the building line of the existing rear and side extension. It would be set back from the front of the dwelling, with the ridge line set down from the existing ridge line.
6. The proposed extension, in combination with the existing extension would be highly visible on the prominent corner location. The development would appear as an excessive addition when viewed from the roads. In comparison to the other corner plots within the immediate vicinity, the proposal would protrude

significantly to the rear with the side projection appearing as an awkward addition out of character with the prevailing form of development. It would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area.

7. Reference has been made to examples of extensions within the area. However, the majority of these are not directly comparable as, many are not corner plots, and none project from the main flank wall in the manner proposed for this development. Each case must be considered on its own merits and these examples do not mitigate or outweigh the harm identified.
8. The side access and boundary wall are proposed to be maintained, and effort has been made to prevent a loss of light to the adjoining neighbouring occupiers. However, these are neutral matters in the overall consideration of the appeal, and they would not mitigate the harm identified.
9. For the reasons given above, the extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies D1 and D3 of the London Plan 2021, which seeks to enhance local context by delivering buildings that respond to local distinctiveness through scale, appearance and shape with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ms S Maur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR