



---

## Appeal Decision

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

### Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 August 2025

---

#### Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/25/3366938

#### 15 Edison Drive, Ealing, Southall UB1 3JS

- 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 Ajay Vadher against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
  - The application Ref is 250870HH.
  - The development proposed is a single storey side extension and rear extension.
- 

#### 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.

#### Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

#### Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Number 15 Edison Drive (No 15) is a two storey semi-detached residential property located on a prominent corner of a distinctive U-shaped development which incorporates Edison Drive, Longridge Lane and Darwin Drive in its constitution. No 15 has both front and side elevations exposed to the public realm meaning that it plays a prominent role within its setting and forms part of the building line on both of these street frontages. The U-shaped design is visually striking and there is an area predominantly laid to grass and surrounded by a footway contained within the U-shape. Buildings are predominantly matching materials of construction and of a similar size and design. The building lines of development in this location are clearly demarcated, and the uniform design and U-shape significantly and positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposed development consists of the construction of a single storey side extension; a single storey rear extension; and the relocation of the main entrance door from the side to the front. The proposed side extension would harmfully interrupt the clear and established building line from number 11 to No 15 Edison Drive, which forms an important part of the U-shape design feature, and as such the proposal would fail to respond positively to local distinctiveness. The

encroachment of development in this prominent location would adversely affect and draw attention away from the patterned form of development that makes a significant positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

6. I acknowledge that matching materials are proposed, and this would assimilate the development with the host property. However, this does not overcome the harm that would be caused due to the siting of the development and the erosion of the defined building line, which I have identified is a positive characteristic of the area.
7. My attention is drawn to side extensions at numbers 8 and 10 Edison Drive. These extensions do not interrupt the front building line of the locally distinctive U-shape and as such I differentiate them from the subject appeal. Furthermore, my attention is drawn to development at number 1 Edison Drive, and to development at the adjacent number 2 Darwin Drive, both of which are located adjacent to each other on a prominent corner plot that forms part of the locally distinctive U-shape. Whilst these developments are visible, they do not breach the distinctive building line that forms the locally distinctive U-shape and therefore, do not detract from the visually distinctive development which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. As such I differentiate these developments from the subject appeal.
8. Accordingly, the proposal would constitute an unsympathetic form of development which would be incoherent within its surroundings, failing to adhere to the character and design language of the area.
9. It would therefore cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such, this proposed development conflicts with Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021), Policies 7B, and 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management DPD (2013) and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), insofar as they seek high quality design that responds to local distinctiveness and coherent development that compliments the street sequence, building pattern and has a positive visual impact.

### **Other Matters**

10. I acknowledge the appellant's ownership of the land to the side of the property to which the side extension is proposed. Land ownership is not a land use planning matter in this case, nor is it relevant in the consideration of character and appearance. I therefore give this limited weight.
11. The appellant has referred to the fact that the proposal would comply with policies aimed at ensuring developments do not harm the living conditions of occupants of existing properties. However, the absence of such harm is a neutral matter in the appeal. Similarly, the lack of objections is a neutral factor. The lack of objections is not indicative of public support for a development.
12. I acknowledge that the development would increase the size of a family property. However, these are primarily personal circumstances that seldom outweigh land use planning matters. The issue of economic benefits has also been raised. Whilst there is no quantifiable data before me in order to give this significant weight in favour of the development, these are likely to be very minor given the scale of the development. I therefore give them limited weight in the appeal.

13. The appellant has referred to the removal of an existing substandard rear addition. The proposed development is unlikely to be the sole means of removing this existing extension and it does not outweigh the harm I have identified. I give this limited weight.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

14. 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**

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

*A M Nilsson*

INSPECTOR