
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2025

by F P Tinsley MA (Hons) MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/25/3374134

300 Norwood Road, Southall, Ealing, London UB2 4JH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
- The appeal is made by Mr A Singh Bazaz against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
- The application reference is Ref: 252962VAR
- The application sought planning permission for 'construction of a semi-detached house (following demolition of existing dwellinghouse) (retrospective) without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref: 251337FUL.
- The condition in dispute is No 2 which states: 'The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawings and documents: Location Plan, Pre-Existing & Proposed Plans, Pre-Existing & Proposed Elevations & Sections, Landscape Proposal, Landscape Planting Plan, Ground Investigation Report, Drainage Strategy, Planning Statement and Design and Access Statement, Energy Statement'
- The reason given for the condition is 'For the avoidance of doubt, and in the interests of proper planning.'

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. During my site visit, I observed that in the location of the larger of the proposed rooflights, on the main front roof plane of the dwelling, a large rooflight has been installed. However, this installation differs in design from the proposal shown on the submitted drawings, as it projects markedly from the roof surface, whereas the rooflight detailed in the application drawings subject to the appeal is approximately flush with the roof surface. The roof of the projecting front bay extension appeared as the approved drawings.
3. The planning application form states that the works for which permission was sought had commenced though were not completed. The Council's documentation indicates that both rooflights were installed, although in a form projecting significantly further forward from the roof surface than shown in the drawings subject to this appeal.
4. Nevertheless, the application before me seeks permission for the installation of both rooflights in the form detailed on the submitted application drawings, that is their positioning approximately flush with the roof surface as distinct from the

rooflight in place which projects markedly from the roof surface, and I have determined the appeal on this basis which is consistent with the application drawings. The approved plans for the dwelling do not include rooflights in the location sought in the application before me and subject to the appeal. In this regard the proposal is not retrospective as the rooflight in situ is not consistent with the application drawings.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of varying the condition on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, street scene and wider area having particular regard to the proposed rooflights on the front elevation.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is located on Norwood Road, a busy suburban street characterised by generally semi-detached and detached two-storey dwellings. The prevailing character is typical of mid-twentieth-century suburban form, with common architectural features near the appeal site including bay and bow windows, pitched and hipped roofs, and pitched porches. Most houses are set back from the road behind front gardens, which often serve as off-street parking, and benefit from large rear gardens.
7. A significant number of properties close to the appeal site have been subject to extensions and modernisation, including alterations to the front elevations and changes to roofscapes. Nevertheless, there is discernible homogeneity in the form, pitch and predominance of tiling in the roofscape which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
8. Policy 7A (Amenity) and Policy 7B (Design Amenity) of the Ealing Development Management DPD (2013) require development to achieve high standards of amenity, including through design. Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021) emphasise that development should be of high quality and represent the most appropriate form of development that responds to the site's context. They highlight the importance of creating homes that maximise daylight and sunlight, which are not only functional but also contribute positively to the urban environment.
9. The proposed installation of a rooflight on the bay-front extension would constitute a substantial addition to this the secondary roof plane, extending across almost the entire roof space of the bay-front extension. Its highly prominent position at the very front of the building, without any screening, would have an overly dominant and harmful impact on the front elevation of the building and the streetscape. This would be the case particularly at night, when illumination from the rooflight would draw attention to the feature. Hence, even taking account of variations in the design of houses in the street, this element of the proposed installation would be disproportionate. It would detract from the design composition of the front of the dwelling and make the roofscape appear cluttered. Therefore, it would fail to respond positively to its context and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
10. The proposed rooflight on the primary roof plane would also represent a significant addition. However, relative to the larger area of the primary tiled roof it would read as a more proportionate feature to the overall building and its context. Furthermore, its position partially behind the bay-front extension and at a higher

level means it would have a less obvious presence in the street scene, thereby reducing its visual impact. Although it would still be a prominent feature, because of the factors outlined, it would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

11. The appellant has identified benefits associated with the proposal which are noted, including improved access to natural light for residents of the dwelling and enhanced energy performance. I also note that the proposal is not located within a Conservation Area. Nevertheless, these matters do not address nor outweigh the harm I have identified.
12. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed variation to condition 2 to substitute plans that include the provision of both rooflights, would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the street scene, and the wider area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies 7A (Amenity) and 7B (Design Amenity) of the Ealing Development Management DPD (2013).

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given and having considered all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

F P Tinsley
INSPECTOR