



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2023

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27.12.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/23/3329978

2 Currey Road, Greenford, Middlesex, UB6 0BD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr M Gohil against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 232720HH, dated 4 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 22 August 2023.
 - The proposed development is a single story rear/side wrap around extension; part first floor side extension; front porch extension; and associated internal and external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single story rear/side wrap around extension; part first floor side extension; front porch extension; and associated internal and external alterations at 2 Currey Road, Greenford, Middlesex, UB6 0BD in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 232720HH, dated 4 July 2023, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

Preliminary matter

2. In the interests of clarity and accuracy I have used the Council's description of the proposal used in its decision notice rather than the description found in the original application form.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is sited at the end of a small terrace of dwellings in a street of distinct suburban characteristics. Judging from the officer report, the proposed first floor extension and the porch elements are acceptable to the Council, and I have no reason to disagree with that assessment.
5. However, the appellant also proposes a combined rear and side single storey extension in a wrap around form. This is the basis of the Council's main concern. It considers its scale, in terms of its footprint, to be excessive in relation to that of the host property. The Council acknowledges that a previous proposal for a longer rear extension was granted prior approval, but that

proposal did not involve a side extension, so that aspect of the planning history was given little weight.

6. In relation to the side extension the Council says that it would extend up to the front elevation, and the absence of a set back would cause an '*unbalanced appearance*' and a failure to appear subservient to the host property. But as I read the plans, perceived subservience of the extensions taken as a whole would be achieved at the front by the set back of the proposed first floor extension and the small roof feature linking it with the floor below. From most vantage points at the front in the public realm the ground floor extensions would appear as minor additions, in scale with the host property. To my mind, although there would be a significant increase in the overall footprint of the dwelling, this has no unacceptable or harmful extraneous effects.
7. I conclude that the proposed development would not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings. Accordingly, there is no material conflict with those aspects of the Council's Development Management Development Plan Document policies 7.4 & 7B and policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan directed to ensure that the design and scale of new development respects local character.

Conditions

8. The Council's suggested conditions regarding materials and that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans shall be imposed in the interests of visual amenity and certainty respectively.
9. The officer report raises an 'objection' to the development on the grounds that a side window in the proposed first floor extension would cause overlooking and loss of privacy to the residents of the properties in Oldfield Lane North. This, however, does not appear as a reason for refusal in the Council's decision notice. To my mind, the objection raised by officers can be appropriately dealt with by means of a condition, and one is imposed so as to safeguard neighbouring privacy.

Other matters

10. All other matters raised in the representations have been taken into account, including the appellant's references to other Council decisions granting permission for what are considered to be similar proposals. These attract little weight since I do not have the full details of the cases referred to, and in any event, I find that most cases are different to one another, depending on circumstances.
11. No other matter is of such strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations that led me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos: 2CR/100; 2CR/101; 2CR/102; 2CR/300/B; 2CR/301/A.
4. The windows to be inserted in the side elevation of the first floor extension hereby permitted shall be obscurely glazed and non-openable below a height of 1.7m above internal finished floor level. Once inserted the window shall be retained in that form.