



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2026

by D Marley BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/25/3375936

206 Pitshanger Lane, Ealing W5 1QG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Sally and Kim Merrick against the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 243863HH.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension with mono pitched roof, and alterations to rear paving.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal was amended during the course of the planning application to reduce the extent of the rear extension and remove the proposed double gate at the front. I have therefore made a consequential amendment to the description of development used in my banner heading above, and have also removed reference to terms which do not constitute an act of development.
3. The Council did not determine the application. However, it has indicated that had it been able to issue a decision, it would have refused permission on the grounds that it considers the application unacceptable with regards its effect upon the significance of the Brentham Garden Estate Conservation Area (the 'Conservation Area').

Main Issue

4. The main issue is, therefore, the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is within the Conservation Area. The statutory duty set out in section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the 'Act') requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. Insofar as relevant to the appeal, the Conservation Area draws its significance from, amongst other matters, its distinctive and varied architecture, alongside the historic importance of the estate layout and the associated response of built form to this layout.
6. The appeal site comprises the existing dwelling which forms part of a set of terraced properties arranged in an approximate crescent at the junction between

Pitshanger Lane and Ludlow Road. This curved arrangement acts to somewhat enclose the rear of the appeal site. The rear elevation includes an existing window on the ground floor. The main roof of the dwelling is largely of traditional appearance and is relatively steeply pitched.

7. The proposed development would introduce a single storey extension across the majority of the width of the rear of the property. The proposed roof of the extension would have a relatively shallow pitch. The plans identify that the existing window would be reused in the extension, and that the eaves of the proposed extension would be the same as the main house. The proposed extension would be visible from private vantage points and from the shared private green space to the rear.
8. As a result of its relatively shallow pitch, the roof of the proposed extension would contrast with the significantly steeper pitch of the main dwelling. The proposed roof would therefore appear as an uncomfortable juxtaposition with the roof of the main dwelling and therefore undermine the host dwelling's architecture. Such an approach would additionally conflict with the Brentham Garden Estate Conservation Area Policy and Design Guide (1988/2012) (the 'Policy and Design Guide') which identifies that particular care is required in the design of roof slopes in extensions.
9. In addition, given the width of the proposed extension, and the curved arrangement and associated enclosed nature of the row of terraced properties of which the appeal site forms a part, the proposal would appear of comparatively large extent in terms of its built form. The Brentham Garden Estate Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2008) (the 'Character Appraisal') identifies that the way in which buildings curve around corners is a particularly important characteristic of the Conservation Area. The Character Appraisal further identifies that oversized extensions can result in harm to the Conservation Area. Given its extent, the size of the rear extension would disrupt the crescent arrangement of the terrace, and would appear incongruous with the host dwelling when viewed from private vantage points, and thus undermine the historic significance of the estate layout. It would thus fail to accord with the size guidelines for rear extensions set out in the Policy and Design Guide, as well as conflict with the guidelines of the Brentham Garden Estate Conservation Area Management Plan (2008) which seeks to avoid over large extensions.
10. As the existing window would be retained as part of the proposals, its re-use in the proposed extension would not harm the significance of the Conservation Area. Equally, although full details of the proposed eaves are not before me, the plans nevertheless identify that the proposed eaves would match those on the host dwelling. Both such matters could have been appropriately managed by condition, had I not found harm arising in other regards.
11. Given the above, the proposal would result in harm to the significance of the Conservation Area. In terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework'), I find the harm to the Conservation Area would be 'less than substantial', and located at the lower end of the spectrum. That the proposal would be visible primarily from private vantage points does not diminish this harm, nor would it be overcome by the appellant's proposal to use matching materials for the proposed extension. Under such circumstances, Paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. No clear public benefits have been put forward, and the primary outcome of the development, namely the provision of additional living space and improved

quality of accommodation, is a private benefit to the appellant. Therefore, there are insufficient public benefits arising from the proposal to outweigh the harm I have identified and the great weight I have given to the heritage asset's conservation.

12. My attention has been drawn to a number of nearby rear extensions which have been constructed or granted planning permission. I do not have full details before me with regards the circumstances under which they were constructed or the planning considerations which may have applied. Further, the nearby examples I have been directed to either do not share the terrace's crescent arrangement or, in the case of the neighbouring property, has an extension that appears more subservient to the host dwelling when compared to the appeal proposal. I therefore cannot draw any direct comparison with the proposal, and these examples do not lead me to an alternative conclusion on the main issue.
13. I acknowledge that the appellant reduced the extent of the proposed rear extension during the course of the planning application. I have in any event made my assessment on the revised proposals.
14. For the above reasons, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and would be contrary to the requirements of the Act. The proposed development would conflict with Policy 2.10 of the Development Strategy 2026 Development Plan Document (2012), Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Development Management Development Plan Document (2013), and Policies D3, D4, D6 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021. Amongst other matters, these policies seek that development proposals enhance local context, be of high quality design and meet wider design requirements, complement their context, building patterns and scale, and conserve the significance of heritage assets.

Other Matters

15. I acknowledge the appellant's concerns over the Council's handling of the application. However, this is not a matter which has any bearing on the planning merits before me in this appeal, and does not alter my findings. Equally, although I acknowledge some local support for the proposals, this does not justify a development I have found would be contrary to the requirements of the Act.

Conclusion

16. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and material considerations, including the Framework, do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed and planning permission should be refused.

D Marley

INSPECTOR