



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2025 by Sara Manson DipTP

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 MAY 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/25/3361093

75 Currey Road, Greenford, Ealing UB6 0BG

- 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 David Hackett against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 244639HH.
 - The development proposed is described as a single storey rear extension; first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for development described as a single storey rear extension; first floor rear extension at 75 Currey Road, Greenford, Ealing UB6 0BG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 244639HH, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location and Block Plan PL2-75-01, Existing and Proposed Ground Floor Plans PL2-75-02, Existing and Proposed First Floor Plan PL2-75-03, Existing and Proposed Front, Rear and Side Elevation Plan PL2-75-03, and Existing and Proposed Roof Plan PL2-75-04.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension shall match those used in the existing building.

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 Matters and Main Issue

3. The description above is taken from the decision notice since it is more accurate and precise in its identification of the development to which the appeal relates and is reflected by that shown on the originally submitted plans. The Council do not object to the single storey rear extension element of the appeal scheme. It benefits from prior approval and is currently under construction. My recommendation therefore focusses on the first floor rear extension and specifically its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is located on a busy residential street comprising mostly two storey terrace dwellings of similar nature. In this section, it appears there used to be a block of five. In the immediate vicinity, the end terraces have been extended to the side and rear, including the group in which the appeal property sits. As a result, and due to their clustered feel and lack of spacing between the blocks, this part of Currey Road reads as a continuous row of terrace properties.
5. The appeal property is a mid-terrace, the rear of which can be viewed from a small section of Rothesay Avenue and Worcester Gardens. The proposal would be viewed in context with the existing development. Namely the rear two storey extension and dormer window at Number 81, the large box dormer window of adjoining neighbours Number 77 and the rear two-storey extension of Number 69a. Along with other large dormer windows in the vicinity, all of which are significantly more prominent than the proposals would be. Furthermore, and although not comparable in design with the existing development, the proposal would not be an unattractive design. It would be set down from the existing ridgeline and stepped in either side, thereby reducing its overall mass and proportions but still responding to the prevailing roof pitch, in line with guidance contained in the Ealing Design Guidance 2022 (EDG). Due to its scale, the proposal would not be a dominant or incongruous addition that would harm either the host property or the character or appearance of the area.
6. Therefore, the proposed first floor rear extension would not conflict with Policies D3 or D4 of The London Plan 2021, Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document 2013, guidance contained in the EDG and draft Policy DAA of the Draft Ealing Local Plan 2024. Collectively, and amongst other things, these require proposals to positively respond to local distinctiveness and complement their building pattern, scale, materials and detailing, ensuring a positive visual impact.

Conditions

7. Whilst work has started on a single storey rear extension, this is the implementation of an extant prior approval. The same element in this scheme seeks express planning permission. Development has thus not commenced in respect of the appeal scheme. I have therefore set out the standard time condition as well as one requiring development to accord with the approved plans, as this provides certainty and precision. A condition requiring the use of materials matching that of the existing building is necessary to ensure an appropriate appearance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

8. The appeal scheme would comply with the development plan for the reasons I have set out and there is nothing to suggest a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions specified.

Sara Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

9. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted, subject to the conditions set out.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR