
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2026 by L Clark MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 April 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/C/24/3343815

Land at 21 Beatrice Road, Southall UB1 1RJ

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Zeeshan Yousuf against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The notice was issued on 14 March 2024.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, construction of a single storey extension to the front elevation of the property.
 - The requirements of the notice are to 1. Remove the front extension in its entirety, 2. Restore the front elevation of the dwelling to a matching condition before the breach occurred and 3. Clear all resultant debris.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is within three months from the date that the notice takes effect.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the ground set out in section 174(2)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, the enforcement notice is quashed and planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act (as amended) for the development already carried out, namely the single storey extension to the front elevation of the property at 21 Beatrice Road, Southall UB1 1RJ as shown on the plan attached to the notice.

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.

Preliminary Matter and Main Issue

3. Prior to the making of this recommendation, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) was published. Having reviewed the changes, I am satisfied that they do not affect the substantive matters of the appeal and that proceeding without further consultation with the main parties would not be prejudicial to their respective cases in regard to the appeal. The main issue in respect of which is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a terraced dwelling set within a residential area. There is some consistency between the properties on Beatrice Road in terms of the groups

of terraces with hipped roofs, their set back positions and their forward projections at first floor and ground floor levels. However, many have been individually altered and therefore there is not a sense of defining uniformity between them.

5. The front extension to the property is contextually small and whilst I agree that it protrudes further forwards than some of the other forward projections, this is only by a small degree. The front extension is also partially open which alleviates the obviousness of its appearance making it more akin to a porch.
6. There are a variety of materials used on surrounding buildings and boundary treatments on Beatrice Road including different coloured UPVC and renders, exposed brick and pebble dash. Therefore, although the materials used are not the same as the adjoining properties, they are similar to those already seen on Beatrice Road. Furthermore, a materials contrast is not uncommon on houses near to the site and therefore the development does not stand out as an incongruous feature.
7. The development does not therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. The development meets the requirements of Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan document 2013 which are concerned with local character amongst other things.

Other Matters

8. The canopy may have removed a decorative diamond feature detail between the ground and first floors, but this is not a defining characteristic of the property or the area. The canopy is above the ground floor window, but the window has not been removed and therefore the vertical alignment of the property remains. The original frontage is still discernible. In accordance with SPD 4 Residential Extensions, for the reasons outlined above, the development respects the character of the existing house.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should succeed and planning permission should be granted for a single storey extension to the front elevation of the property.

L Clark

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed. The effect of this is that the enforcement notice is quashed, and planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR