



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2025 by S Wilson LL.B. MSc MRTPI

Decision by Kenneth Stone BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/25/3363374

13 St. Georges Avenue, Ealing, Southall UB1 1PZ

- 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 Pavan Kainth against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 244278HH.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Double side/rear extension and loft conversion.'
-

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. During the application process the description of development changed from that on the application form. I have not been provided with any confirmation that this change was agreed by the parties. Therefore, I have used the original description which is, in any case, sufficient for the purposes of identifying the works to which the appeal relates.

Main Issue

4. Whether the plans are sufficiently accurate to assess the proposal in terms of the effect it would have on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. 13 St. Georges Avenue is a semi-detached residential dwelling located in a street of similarly sized and styled properties. There is a uniformity to their building line, hipped roofs and use of materials which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
6. Details before me indicate: a hip to gable roof extension with mansard style flat roofed dormer to the main rear roof; part single and part two storey extensions to the side and rear elevations; and the installation of two rooflights to the front roofslope. However, the submitted plans mostly lack dimensions and do not clearly show where the rear roof dormer would meet the eaves of the main roof consistently on the plans. The proposed east elevation showing the rear roof

dormer, could be read as if there would be no step back of the dormer from the eaves and that the dormer would be vertical up to the flat roof. This directly contradicts the south elevation depiction and the A-B South Elevation/Roof Section plan. As such, essentially there are different schemes that have been submitted.

7. If I were to approve the proposal, and in the interest of precision, I would be statutorily required to condition that the proposal would be built according to the plans. Given the inaccuracies highlighted, I cannot be certain that what would be constructed would match the approved plans. Paragraph 140 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework) requires clear and accurate plans and drawings to enable a clear basis for Local Planning Authorities to identify any breaches of planning control. Nor would reasonable conclusions be able to be drawn as to the impact of the development and therefore whether compliance with the Development Plan Policies can be demonstrated as is necessary and proportionate.
8. Accordingly, the impact of the development on the character of the area and host dwelling and the impact of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties cannot be accurately determined and the proposal would fail to demonstrate compliance with Policies D4 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), Policies 7A, 7B and 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) and the relevant paragraphs of the Framework, insofar as they seek high quality design that reflects local distinctiveness and protects occupiers of neighbouring properties amenity. Furthermore, the proposal conflicts with paragraph 140 of the Framework insofar as it requires clear and accurate drawings which provide visual clarity about the design of the development.

Other Matters

9. I note the Appellant's comments in relation to their frustrations with the Council's communication and the way in which it handled the planning application. However, in this regard such matters do not impact on the planning merits of the proposal and consequently are not matters that are for my consideration in relation to this appeal and are more appropriately addressed to the Council.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR