
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2025

by **C Housden BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/25/3363313

66 Carlyle Road, Ealing W5 4BL

- 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 Rose against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application ref is 243958FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor and rear dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. On my visit I observed that the proposed rear dormer was already built. Notwithstanding, I have assessed the proposal on the basis of the plans before me.
3. The evidence before me shows that the main dispute between the parties relates to the acceptability of the first-floor rear extension and not the dormer window or rooflights. On this basis and the evidence before me, my decision will focus on the first floor extension.

Main Issues

4. It follows from the procedural matters above that the main issues relevant to the appeal are the effect of the first floor rear extension on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of 64 Carlyle Road (No 64), with particular regard to the provision of daylight, sunlight and outlook in relation to the rear windows and garden of the property.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. Carlyle Road primarily consists of two storey properties with consistent architectural features that are organised in terraced arrangements with two-storey rear outrigger extensions. The area has a predominantly suburban character and appearance.
6. The appeal proposal relates to 66 Carlyle Road (No 66) which comprises a two storey end of terrace property situated in a corner plot at the junction of Carlyle Road with Junction Road. Due to its location in a corner plot, the property is larger than most and its side elevation is situated directly adjacent to the pavement of Junction Road.

7. Open views of the rear of the appeal site and much of the terrace along Carlyle Road are a prominent feature within Junction Road. The consistency in the length and proportions of the rear outriggers of the properties along Carlyle Road provides a cohesive and regular rhythm of development which is a positive feature within the streetscene of Junction Road. There is also an appreciable gap in the built form behind the terrace of houses which positively contributes to the character of the area.
8. Whilst No 66 has been subject to a number of extensions, the positive feature of the outrigger and open space behind the Carlyle Road terrace is still a prevalent feature within the Junction Road streetscene.
9. The appeal proposal would involve an extension at first floor level to the outrigger which would be set down from the existing ridge and would not extend the overall footprint of the building. However, due to the significant depth the extension would add to the outrigger at first floor level, the appeal proposal would appear as an incongruous addition to the host property with an outrigger far longer than any other property within the streetscene. As a result, it would appear dominating and overbearing on the host property and adjacent street. The terrace would lose the appearance of the regular rhythm of the outriggers which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, given the length of the extension it would also create a visually enclosing effect within the street which would diminish the positive gap behind the properties of Carlyle Road.
10. This would be the case despite acknowledging the use of matching materials, similar width and depth to the existing structures on site, windows aligning with existing fenestration, no loss of amenity space, the proposal seeking to optimise and upgrade the quality of the property and lack of visibility from Carlyle Road.
11. The appeal proposal would therefore result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and would therefore conflict with Policies 7B and 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management DPD (2013) (DMDPD) and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) (LP). These policies, amongst other matters, seek to achieve a high standard of design by ensuring a positive visual impact, that development complements the building pattern, ensuring development responds to a site's context, positively responds to local distinctiveness and responds to existing character.

Living conditions of No 64

12. Whilst situated in a built-up suburban context, there is nevertheless a sense of spaciousness to the rear of the terraces through a lack of first floor development past the building line of the existing outriggers. The appeal proposal would introduce a deep extension at first floor level that would extend far past the other nearby outriggers within the terrace. This would create an enclosing and oppressive effect to the rear windows of No 64 and its garden which would cause a loss of outlook resulting in considerable harm to the living conditions of its occupiers. The extension being set moderately off the boundary and the presence of existing ground floor development at the appeal site is insufficient to overcome or justify this harm I have found owing to the depth of the first floor extension. This would be the case despite the absence of any direct overlooking.

13. In relation to daylight and sunlight, the appellant has stated that the proposal would comply with the 45 degree BRE Guide basic test in relation to the rear windows of No 64. However, this is not depicted on the drawings.
14. Furthermore, in support of the appeal a Shadow Study Report¹ (the Report) has been submitted. The Report confirms that it is limited to assessing the effect of the appeal proposal on the garden of No 64 only, not the dwelling itself. The Report concludes that the appeal proposal would exceed the BRE test relating to at least 50% of No 64's rear garden area receiving a minimum of two hours of sunlight on the 21st of March.
15. However, the Report does not present the baseline assessment, and it does not allow me to compare the existing situation to the proposed. Meeting the abovementioned BRE standards, does not necessarily mean there isn't a materially harmful loss of light to the rear garden of No 64 compared to the existing situation. I have insufficient evidence to conclude that the proposal would not result in materially harmful overshadowing to No 64.
16. Similarly, given the location of the extension in relation to No 64, its height and extensive depth, I do not have sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the proposal would not result in massing above ground floor level that would lead to additional overshadowing in the afternoon which would result in a loss of sunlight and daylight to the rear windows of No 64. I do not have sufficient evidence to conclude that this would not be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 64.
17. The proposal would therefore result in detrimental effects to the living conditions to the occupiers of No 64 through a harmful loss of daylight, sunlight and outlook to the rear windows and garden of the property. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy 7B of the DMDPD and Policies D3 and D6 of the LP. These policies, amongst other matters, seek to provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to new and surrounding houses that is appropriate for its context whilst minimising overshadowing, and delivering appropriate outlook, privacy and amenity.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

C Housden

INSPECTOR

¹ Shadow Study Report by LandScore Group dated 31/03/2025