



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2025

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/25/3370112

3 Thorndike Avenue, Northolt, Ealing, UB5 5LA

- 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 Anil Kakkar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 251780HH.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a double storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and wider area, and upon the living conditions at 5 Thorndike Avenue, with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mid-terraced, two-storey dwelling set within a wider residential estate development of similar style properties, mostly dating from the latter half of the 20th century. No 3 has an existing single-storey extension to the rear across its full width, with a further, more lightweight, conservatory addition beyond. The proposal would add a gabled, 4m deep first-floor extension spanning just over half the width of the dwelling. This would be set marginally away from the common side boundary with No 5, and around 2.8m away from the side boundary with No 1.

Character and Appearance

4. Properties along Thorndike Avenue run approximately north-south and back on to similar properties arranged parallel along Lynne Way, with reasonably deep gardens between. The backs of the dwellings and garden spaces are openly seen over the side return boundary enclosures to the respective end of terrace dwellings from Rubens Road to the north, and which runs east to west. From this aspect, a sense of space to the rear garden settings can be appreciated, along with uniformity to the terraced rows at first-floor level and above, with unbroken roof and eaves lines.
5. The appellant has pointed to a number of examples where front and/or rear gabled projections feature within the locality. I observed these for myself. In most cases,

these appeared to me as original features to some of the end terraced properties, effectively acting as a deliberate 'bookend' to the row, as is the case at 10 Lynne Way and 1 Lauder Close. Similar arrangements exist further from the appeal site but within the same estate, including the short terrace at Nos 2a-2d Lauder Close, which is a modern interpretation of the estate's development pattern. Along some terraced rows, the building line is stepped, as is the case between Nos 4 and 6 Lynne Way. This too is an original feature of the development pattern and adds relief to some of the terraced rows, without disrupting the uniform profile of the houses at first floor and roof levels. The examples at Nos 2a and 2b Rubens Road are a contemporary modern semi-detached pair, with a shared rear gabled projection, and bear little correlation to the mid-terraced nature of the appeal property.

6. In contrast to the gabled features I observed within the locality, the proposed extension to No 3 would atypically project from a dwelling in a mid-terraced position. By adding considerable bulk at first floor and roof levels, it would significantly alter the dwelling from one of modest size and general conformity within the terrace, to one of far greater scale and individual dominance. This would be openly seen in the outlook from the backs of properties in Lynne Way, as well as from all surrounding gardens and the public domain along Rubens Road, as incongruous and out of keeping within its rear garden setting, and detrimental to the visual harmony of the local development pattern.
7. I recognise that the proposed extension would benefit the appellant and help to meet their family's needs, but in the overall balance this does not outweigh the visual harm that I have identified. By failing to respect the visual character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding built form, the proposal would fail to display the high quality of design that is required by Policies 7B and 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (DMDPD), adopted in 2013, and Policies D3 and D4 of The London Plan 2021 (TLP).

Living Conditions

8. The extension would be set a reasonable distance away from the common side boundary with 1 Thorndike Avenue, which is to the south side of the appeal property. I share the Council's view that the extension would have no significant impact upon the living conditions of these neighbouring occupiers.
9. The extension would be set close to the side boundary with No 5. During my visit, I observed No 5 to have a reasonably deep single-storey lean-to extension across its full width, with a further lightweight addition beyond. Given this, despite its close proximity and depth, I am satisfied that the extension would not be seen in the outlook from the neighbour's ground floor living space, and that it would have no impact of any significance when seen from the neighbour's rear garden area.
10. The Council has raised concern over the impact upon the nearest first-floor window to No 5, which they take to be a habitable room. However, I observed this window to have a shallow depth and to be partially obscurely glazed. It was a mirror image of the glazing pattern to the appeal property. In the absence of any compelling evidence to support the Council's assertion, based on the layout of No 3, my own observations, representations made by the appellant, and the absence of any neighbour objection, I consider it most likely that the nearest window, which would be most affected by the size and position of the proposed extension, serves a non-

habitable bathroom space. In these circumstances, I am not persuaded that there would be any impact upon the living conditions at 5 Thorndike Avenue that would be significant or harmful. As such, I find no conflict in this regard with DMDPD Policy 7B, or with TLP Policies D3 and D6, as far as between them they seek to safeguard the standard of amenity for adjacent uses.

Conclusion

11. Notwithstanding my findings on the second main issue, for the reasons given, I find the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of 3 Thorndike Avenue and the wider area. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR