



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2025 by K Hole BA (Hons)

Decision by Mr A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/24/3355096

27 Whitton Drive, Greenford, UB6 0QY

- 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 Jay Inamdar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 242111HH.
 - The development proposed is the retention of single storey, part two storey, side/rear extension: alteration of roof from hip to gable end: rear roof extension and installation of two roof lights to front roofscape.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeal evidence confirms that the development has been completed and I was able to see this on my site visit. Therefore, I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling located in a suburban, residential area characterised by a mix of semi-detached dwellings and smaller blocks of terraced dwellings. On my site visit I observed several dwellings on Whitton Drive and further afield have been altered and extended to the front and sides which creates a reasonably varied street scene in terms of design and appearance.
6. To the front of the appeal property, the development comprises a two-storey side extension, hip to gable roof alteration, two roof lights and a canopy extension to the side of the existing porch. The two-storey side extension includes a gable end roof which matches the design of the hip to gable roof alteration. It is set back from the front elevation with a scale that is subservient to the host dwelling. The canopy extension does not project any further forward of the existing porch, therefore while

volume is added to the porch overall, the canopy extension is not an incongruous addition to the front elevation of the appeal property.

7. The semi-detached dwelling that adjoins the appeal property has a two-storey side extension with a hipped roof. It does not have a front porch, although the porch roof is similar to the appeal property in that it runs from the bay window to the edge of the dwelling at first floor level. Viewing the two dwellings as a pair, they do differ in terms of design, however they are of equal scale. Together with the design variances to the front and sides of other dwellings within the vicinity, the front and side elements of the development cause no undue harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. However, due to the appeal property's proximity to the junction of Whitton Drive and Woodland Approach, the rear elevation of the appeal property is visually prominent from the public highway on Woodland Approach. To the rear of the property, the development comprises a ground floor rear extension, part two-storey side/rear extension and rear roof extension. At first floor and roof level, the size of the extensions along with the flat roof design appear bulky. The scale and mass of the rear elevation is increased significantly with the extensions appearing discordant with the appeal property and wider area. I therefore find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
9. Consequently, the development fails to accord with policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan (2013) which require new development to complement the local character and provide a positive visual impact particularly in terms of scale and mass.
10. The appellant has provided several examples of dwellings with similar side/rear and roof extensions in the area. I viewed these dwellings from the public highway as part of my site visit. However, as they were generally concealed from the public highway, I was unable to view them in full and within their site context. I was able to view part of the roof extension at 9 Green Gate at a distance from an opening on Whitton Drive East, however was unable to view the rear elevation in full. Given that the appeal development is in a prominent location and the impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area can be seen in its entirety from the public highway on Woodland Approach, these examples cannot be considered as direct comparisons. As such, and in any event, I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.
11. Representations were received from a neighbouring property objecting to the development. However, due to my findings on the main issue described above, it is not necessary to consider these matters further.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Hole

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Mr A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR