



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2026

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 April 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/25/3375264

6 Hodder Drive, Perivale, Ealing UB6 8LH

- 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 Knight against the decision of Ealing Council.
 - The application Ref is 252967HH.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The scheme was amended during its consideration by the Council. My decision is based on those revised drawings, which are listed on the Council's decision notice.
3. I have taken the description of the proposal in my banner from the application form, although I note that on the appeal form and the Council's decision notice it is more accurately described as a part two, part single storey, rear extension.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

5. Viewed in the streetscene, the properties on this side of Hodder Drive are arranged in a series of short, two storey terraces, which are set back from the highway in straight rows, and which are in a similar style with mainly hipped roofs. To the rear I observed that the buildings are less cohesive as a result of incremental changes, including many ground floor projections and some large rectilinear dormers. That said, none of the nearby properties in these terraces have two storey rear projections. As a result, in long views looking along their rear elevations, their original form is still clearly evident and their consistent first floor building line is a significant unifying characteristic.
6. The Council raises no objections to the proposed ground floor extension, and I note that it previously determined that prior approval was not required for a similar single storey extension at this property (Ref: 252966PALHE). In that context, and given the single storey extension's limited height, and that it would be broadly similar to many nearby extensions, I agree that that element of this scheme is acceptable.

7. The proposed first floor would have a hipped roof and it would be set below the terrace's principal ridge line. However, it would project approximately 2 metres to the rear, and in the context of the established character of the area, that projection at this height would markedly disrupt the cohesive building line. Additionally, as its hipped roof would be stepped in slightly from one side, and the extension would cover over half of the host's rear elevation, the resultant building would have a rather awkward, disjointed and bulky form, which would detract from the appearance of the host, this terrace and the area.
8. Although the scheme would not be visible in the streetscene, the harm that I have identified would be clearly evident from the gardens of properties on this part of Hodder Drive, the shared rear access, and from other properties nearby.
9. For these reasons, notwithstanding the proposed matching materials and window style, the scheme would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would thereby conflict with Policies 7B and 7.4, of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document 2013 and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021 ('LP').
10. Amongst other things, and in broad terms, these require high quality, coherent development, which responds to existing character and which has a positive visual impact, having regard to matters including building patterns, scale, appearance and form. Whilst LP Policies D3 and D4 refer to the impact on the public realm, their requirement for good design which responds to existing character is not limited just to publicly visible areas.
11. It would also fail to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework requirement for visually attractive architecture which is sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.
12. Finally, although the dimensions of the rear extension would comply with the numerical standards in the Ealing Design Guidance 2022, and it would not breach 45 degree lines drawn from neighbouring windows, the scheme would fail to comply with its general advice that development should respond to its surroundings with regards matters such as scale and massing, and that extensions should be designed having regard to the rhythm and form of the building, and should avoid visual intrusion.
13. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR