



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2023

**by Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 14<sup>th</sup> December 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/23/3325083**

**300 Norwood Road, Ealing, Southall UB2 4JH**

- 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 Ajmeet Bazaz against the decision of the council of the London Borough of Ealing
  - The application Ref 22242HH, dated 23 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 April 2023.
  - The development proposed is described as part two storey, part single storey rear extension (following demolition of existing outbuilding and single storey rear extension); front porch extension (following alteration to front addition), rear roof extension, extension to main roof from hipped to gable end and alteration of roof of two storey side extension from crowned to hipped roof to main hipped roof slope; extension and installation of three rooflights to front roof slope and alteration to roof of existing front bay windows.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matters

2. During the determination of the application, and with agreement from the appellant, the description of development was amended by the council. I have therefore used the amended description included in the decision notice.

### Reasons

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, street scene and wider area.
4. Norwood Road is a busy urban thoroughfare lined with generally semi-detached and detached two storey dwellings. The character is fairly traditional and there are some common architectural features that occur within the properties near the appeal site. These include bay windows, pitched and hipped roofs and pitched porches. Most houses are set back from the road behind front gardens, which also serve as off street car parking. Most benefit from long rear gardens.
5. At the site visit, I could see that a number of properties had been subject to extensions and significant modernisation, and my attention has been drawn to a number of local examples of this by the appellant in their submissions. Whilst I have considered these examples, I have nevertheless determined this appeal on its own merits.

6. No. 300 is a semi-detached two storey house which has been subject to a number of extensions, most notably a two storey extension to the side. Architecturally, the appeal dwelling fits well into its surroundings and reflects the scale and design of similar properties in the street.
7. The proposals would result in significant single and double height extensions to the rear of the appeal property, together with significant alterations to the front which would result in a more contemporary appearance. The appellant has helpfully supplied 3D imagery of the proposed extension which provides an idea of the overall scale and massing of the appeal scheme.
8. Policy 7B (Design Amenity) of the Ealing Development Management DPD (2013) (DMDPD) seeks high standards of amenity to be achieved through design. Policy LV7.4 (Local Character) of the DMDPD requires that development proposals complement their surroundings, particularly in terms of street sequence, building pattern, scale, materials and detailing.
9. The council have a Housing Design Guidance (2022) supplementary planning document (SPD) which provides guidance for the design of new and alterations to existing dwellings in the Borough.
10. I agree with the council that the proposed alterations to the principal elevation would be acceptable in terms of the modern design, however the additions to the rear of the dwelling are of concern.
11. The proposed additions to the rear would add significant bulk to the host dwelling. These additions would add depth and massing that would dwarf the host dwelling and its neighbours.
12. I note that the appellant has attempted to reduce some of the massing of the rear extension by reducing the ground floor lower than that of the existing floor level of the host dwelling. However, this does little to mitigate for the visual impact that the bulk of the development would have on the surrounding area.
13. When viewed against the neighbouring properties and the original dwelling, I consider that the overall effect would be overbearing and harmful to the character of the host dwelling and wider area. I accept that this harm would be less discernible from the front of the dwelling, but I am required to look at the effects of the proposals in their entirety.
14. In light of the scale and massing of the proposed development, I find that, in particular, the proposals to the rear would result in harm to the existing character of the host dwelling and the wider area, contrary to policies 7B and LV7.4 of the DMDPD, as well as the relevant parts of the Ealing's Housing Design Guidance 2022.

## **Conclusions**

15. For the reasons given and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

*Sian Griffiths*

INSPECTOR