
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025 by K Hole BA (Hons)

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/25/3369847

30 St. Marys Avenue Central, Southall UB2 4LT

- 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 Jeff Pope against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 250986HH.
 - The development proposed is for the construction of part first floor/part two storey side extension, and extension of the hipped roof of the property, a dormer extension, a two-storey rear extension and a single storey rear extension, along with minor alterations.
-

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 Issues

3. The main issues are whether the proposed development would a) be at an unacceptable risk of flooding; and b) preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Norwood Green Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Flood Risk

4. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) sets out that Flood Risk Assessments (FRA) should be appropriate to the scale, nature and location of a development. For example, where it is an extension to a dwelling (for which an application for planning permission is required) which would not significantly increase the number of people present in an area at risk of flooding, a less detailed assessment would be required to be able to reach an informed decision. Nonetheless, the National Planning Policy Framework explains that, amongst other things, householder development should still meet the requirements for site specific FRAs.
5. The appellant has provided a form which contains limited information in respect of the above matters. No information has been provided in respect of estimated flood levels taking into account climate change. Furthermore, the form confirms that floor levels within the proposed development will be set no lower than existing levels and flood proofing of the proposed development has been incorporated where

appropriate. However, no such details have been set out. Indeed, the said form also states that an applicant is to provide such information as part of a FRA.

6. In the circumstances, I can only conclude that it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that the site will be acceptable in terms of flood risk. In that regard it would conflict with Policies SI 12 of the London Plan 2021 (LP) and the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document 2013 (DPD) both of which seek, amongst other things, to minimise flood risk and ensure that new development is not unacceptably vulnerable to flooding.

The Norwood Green Conservation Area (CA)

7. The significance of the CA largely derives from its rural village-like character that is primarily residential and contains a mix of architectural styles that range from the 12th to 20th century, built around a central triangular green that remains the focal point. It has been divided into three areas of character with the appeal site being located within Norwood Green Old Village. This area contains some of the oldest buildings within the CA, but it has evolved over time with the construction of several buildings that are unsympathetic to the prevailing rural character which displays traditional elements of a historic English Village.
8. The appeal property is a detached two-storey hipped roof dwelling featuring a catslide roof to the side over an extension. It is within the St Marys Avenue Estate which is a more modern intervention. According to the Council's Conservation Area Character Appraisal, the properties built as part of the estate make a neutral contribution to the CA as the loss of some of the green hedges and walls that were part of the original development results in a rather undistinguished environment.
9. There are a number of dwellings with catslide roofs nearby however, they are not an overly dominant design feature of the street scene. Therefore, its loss would not have a detrimental effect. Moreover, the appeal property is of different design and appearance to adjacent dwellings. To the left, there is a two-storey dwelling with a hipped roof, to the right a bungalow with a hipped roof and front projecting gable, and to the front, a Victorian end terrace cottage with gable end roof.
10. The roof and side extension would not appear bulky due to the design providing a balanced and symmetrical appearance to the dwelling. Furthermore, the hipped roof that is a common characteristic within the street scene would be retained. The roof extension would comply with guidance in the Norwood Green Conservation Area Management Plan (2007) insofar as it would be built within the existing roof slope without raising the ridge height and conservation style rooflights would be used. Given the design together with the diversity of the immediate street scene, the roof and side extension would not detract from the character or appearance of the area.
11. The two-storey rear extension would act as a relatively small infill which would align with the existing side and rear elevations which would add balance to the rear form of the dwelling. While the depth of the single storey rear extension would exceed guidelines, given the similar depth of the single storey rear extension next door at Number 32 and spacious rear gardens in the area, it would sit comfortably within the plot appearing as a proportionate addition to the enlarged dwelling. The proposed rear roof dormer would be modest, set a sufficient distance in from the hips, below the ridge and above the eaves. As such, it would not dominate the rear roof, complementing the character of the dwelling.

12. Cumulatively, the proposed development would amount to a sizable increase to the scale and mass of the dwelling. However, and for the reasons given above, the proposed design would respect the form and character of the existing dwelling and not amount to an incongruous addition. It would therefore preserve both the character and appearance of the CA. Consequently, it would accord with Policies D3, D4 and HC1 of the LP and 7.4, 7.B and 7C of the DPD. These are design and heritage policies that seek high quality and require development to complement the surrounding street scene, avoiding harm and conserving the significance of heritage assets.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. While the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the CA, this would be as a result of a lack of harm and thus a neutral matter. It has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding. It would conflict with the development plan for this reason and material considerations do not indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Hole

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR