



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2025

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/25/3366640

12 Warwick Road, Southall UB2 4NX

- 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 Jagir Singh against the decision of the Council to the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 251157HH
 - The development proposed is for the construction of two story side extension, part single, part two storey rear extension, rear/side roof extension; alterations to front elevation including bay windows; installation of three front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Warwick Road is characterised by small terraces of modest sized two storey houses whose front elevations and roof slopes are simple and uncluttered above ground floor level. At ground floor level they have front projecting bay windows under mono-pitched roofs that continue over the front entrances. The terraces are set back from the pavement behind small front gardens. The simplicity and uniformity in the design and appearance of the terraces and their modest front gardens make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of Warwick Road.
4. At the top of Warwick Road, adjacent to the junction of Warwick Road and Castle Road there is an end of terrace dwelling with a single two storey projecting bay under a gable roof. Due to its position at the end of a row of terraces and at right angles to Warwick Road it does not disrupt the uncluttered and uniform appearance of the terraces.
5. To the rear of the terraces there are a numerous extensions, although few two storey extensions. Of the 2No. two storey extensions I saw during my site, one had a flat roof and the other had a pitched roof that was set well below the ridge line. Whilst the large flat roofed dormer extensions project close to the ridge line and disrupt the uncluttered roofscape, they do not project beyond the original rear building lines of the terraces. As a consequence, the uniformity of the terraces above ground floor level is evident. These upper floor extensions are clearly visible from Merrick Road.

6. Planning permission has already been granted for various elements of the proposal. The main external differences between the approved and proposed schemes are the inclusion of two storey bays under projecting gables on the front elevation and an increase in the height of the roof of the approved two storey rear extension.
7. Together and amongst other things policies 7B and 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document 2013 (DPD), states that new development should complement their street sequence, building pattern, scale, materials, detailing and context. It should achieve a high standard of amenity for users and neighbours by having a positive visual impact and high quality architecture.
8. The National Planning Policy Framework 2024 sets out a presumption in favour of development and a positive approach to dealing with proposals. Together Paragraphs 131 and 135 of the Framework state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Proposals should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, be sympathetic to local character and history, add to the overall quality of the area and optimise the development potential of the site.
9. The proposed front bays and associated gable roofs would completely change the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The dwelling would appear more assertive, distinct from and out of keeping with the host and adjacent terraces. It would interrupt and undermine the simple, uniform and uncluttered lines of the host terrace, the terraces as a whole and the street scene.
10. The proposed extension would be comparable to the approved rear extension. However, the roof of the approved extension is set down from the ridge line, at a similar level to the rear projection to the dwelling at 2 Warwick Road. This respects the modest scale of the host dwelling and facilitates the continuity of roof form along the terraces when viewed from Merrick Road.
11. Conversely with the appeal proposal the roof of the rear extension would project almost up to the main ridge line. Due to the width of the extension the gable roof would dominate the rear roof slope of the dwelling. As a result of its combined height, width and depth the proposed roof would dominate and be totally out of keeping with the host dwelling and the roofscape of the terraces.
12. Both individually and cumulatively, the harm that would be caused by the front bay windows and associated gables and the roof of the proposed rear two storey extension would clearly outweigh the benefits for the appellant and their family. Having regard to the nature of the harm that would be caused it is not something that could be adequately addressed through the imposition of conditions.
13. Finally, the Council has referred to Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021, which deals with design analysis and development certainty rather than the merits of an individual proposal. As such its relevance to the consideration of the merits of the appeal proposal is limited.
14. I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it would conflict with DPD Policies 7B and 7.4.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR