



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2025

by **B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/24/3354502

58 Elm Tree Close, Northolt, Ealing, UB5 6AR.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr S Gkougklias against the decision of Ealing Council.
 - The application Ref is 241617HH.
 - The development proposed is the erection a single-storey, wrap-around side and rear extension and a single-storey in-fill side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection a single-storey, wrap-around side and rear extension and a single-storey in-fill side extension at 58 Elm Tree Close, Northolt, Ealing, UB5 6AR, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 241617HH, and 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 extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out only in accordance with the following approved plans:

PE-01 Rev. C (Existing Floor Plan, Elevation, Cross Section A-A and Location Plan),
PE-02 Rev. C (Proposed Floor Plan, Block Plan and Elevation),
PE-03 Rev. C (Proposed Cross Section A-A and Elevations).

Procedural Matters

2. The description above is taken from the decision notice, as it most accurately identifies the built development proposed.
3. The appeal property already possesses a substantial rear extension and an impermanent canopy beyond, the latter to be largely replaced by the further extension now proposed. For the purpose of this assessment, like the Council, I disregard the presence of the impermanent canopy.

Main Issues

4. The main issues relate, first, to the character and appearance of the host dwelling itself and of the local area and, second, to the residential amenity of the neighbouring house at No 60 Elm Tree Close.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The side extension would fill the space at the side of the property but would be largely screened from the public footpath adjacent. The proposed construction would incorporate an existing, set-back, flat-roofed, shower room side extension under a new mono-pitch roof, in materials matching the main house.
6. From the front, I consider that the side extension would appear in keeping with and duly subservient to the host dwelling, despite being flush to the front corner of the building. This is due in part to the significant forward projection of the existing front living room to be retained. It follows that the development would not harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling, or the local street scene when viewed from Elm Tree Close.
7. The matching, single-storey, mono-pitch construction would be carried round the back of the property. In my view it would still appear subservient, despite its increased depth over an existing permanent rear extension.
8. There is a notable variety of substantial, single- and two-storey additions to many of the properties in the street, including at No 60 immediately adjacent, and No 56 just across the intervening public footpath. Like the proposed extension, many of these are of full width. In this context, I do not consider that the built additions proposed to No 58 would appear unduly incongruous.
9. I find that the proposed development would cause no significant harm to the character or appearance of either No 58 Elm Tree Close or the wider surrounding area, when viewed from the rear or from any other viewpoint.

Residential Amenity

10. The existing permanent rear extension to No 58 is set away from the shared boundary with No 60. The proposed extension would extend further to the rear and would stand hard against the boundary, with the top of the wall and roof visible above the intervening fence. It would be more noticeable from the rear of No 60.
11. However, No 60 itself has a rear extension and, in my judgement, the degree to which the extension proposed at No 58 would increase any sense of enclosure there or dominate the neighbouring back garden would be slight, compared with the current situation, and would not warrant substantive planning objection in terms of loss of residential amenity.

Conclusions

12. I am acutely alert to the fact that the proposed rear extension would exceed the maximum dimensions set by adopted Housing Design Guidance. However, this guidance, whilst strongly material, does not carry as much weight as adopted development plan policies.

13. Overall, I do not consider that the development proposed in this particular case would undermine the essential objectives of the relevant policies cited by the Council, specifically D3 and D4 of the adopted London Plan and 7.4 and 7B of the adopted Ealing Development Management DPD¹, which seek high quality in the design of new built development, noting that these principles are carried forward in Policy DAA of the new draft Local Plan.
14. For the reasons explained, I regard the development proposed in this case as compliant with the development plan as a whole.
15. I conclude overall that this appeal should be allowed and the permission sought granted, subject only to the standard conditions set out above.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR

¹ Development Plan Document