



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 May 2025

by **Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/25/3361700

100 East Acton Lane, Acton, London, W3 7ER

- 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 M Mijbel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 240046HH.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'rear double storey extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey detached house, built in the inter-war period. It is one of two similar properties on this part of East Acton Lane which is close to a busy junction and includes a wide variety of building ages, sizes and styles, from the terraced mono-pitch roof dwellings to the west of the site to the blocks of flats adjacent to the neighbouring house and opposite the site. Whilst the immediate surroundings of the appeal site are not consistent with one type of design, the Ealing Housing Design Guidance (2022) seeks to ensure that proposals avoid physical and visual dominance.
4. The dwelling has a double fronted design with a main hipped roof and has been previously extended across the whole of the rear elevation with a flat roofed and principally glazed single storey extension. The proposal would remove that and comprises a two storey flat roof extension of some 3.5m in depth that would span almost the whole width of the dwelling with a single storey extension with a lean-to roof projecting for a further 2m beyond that.
5. The rear elevation can be clearly seen from the parking area for the housing to the west of the site (102-112a East Acton Lane) as well as from the front facing windows of those dwellings. When seen from there, as the proposed flat roof at first floor level would fail to reflect the existing main hipped roof, this together with the width of the two storey extension, would result in an overly dominant addition. It would not appear sufficiently subordinate to or reflect the character of the existing dwelling and would therefore fail to enhance the locality.

6. Although the adjacent dwelling has a similar full width two storey rear extension with a flat roof, the Council has said that this was granted planning permission in 1980. I agree that since then there has been much greater emphasis given to the importance of good design in both local and national planning policy. That extension does not, therefore, provide justification for this proposal.
7. I conclude then that, by reason of the width of the two storey extension and its flat roof form, the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. As such, it would be contrary to development plan policies 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management DPD (2013) and D3 of the London Plan (2021) which together seek to ensure that new development complements the scale of, and enhances, the local context. It would also be contrary to the Council's Design Guidance referred to earlier.

Other matter

8. The proposal would provide additional, improved accommodation for the appellant but I am not persuaded that could not be met by an alternative, less dominant scheme and this matter does not, therefore, override my findings.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would be contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

INSPECTOR