Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decisions

by Siobhan Watson BA(Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th August 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/A5270/C/25/3358322
Appeal B Ref: APP/A5270/C/25/3358323
95 Greatdown Road, London, W7 1JR

- The appeals are made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
- Appeal A is made by Mr Abdelhadi Hussein and Appeal B is made by Mrs Elham Elshikh against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
- The notice was issued on 27 November 2024.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: Without planning permission, the erection of an additional single storey rear extension.
- The requirements of the notice are to: 1. Demolish the additional single storey rear extension; and 2. Remove all resulting debris, rubbish and materials from the land.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is: 3 months.
- The appeal is proceeding on the ground set out in section 174(2)(g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Decisions

1. The appeals are dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld.

Reasons

2. An appeal on ground (g) is that the period for compliance with the notice falls short of what is reasonable.

3. The appellants argue that they need at least 6 months to get legal advice and to consider their options. They say that they were led to believe that they had a right to appeal on ground (a) but found, after preparing a case, that ground (a) was barred. However, they have not coherently explained why that factor has had any effect in relation to complying with the notice.

4. The Council says that the extension harms the character and appearance of the Cuckoo Estate Conservation Area and it harms the living conditions of neighbours due to a loss of outlook and a loss of light. As only ground (g) is appealed I have no reason not to uphold the notice. The Council's decision to enforce was legitimate and in the public interest. Given the harm caused by the development, I consider that 3 months would provide a proportionate and reasonable amount of time to undertake the work. Therefore, the appeals on ground (g) fail.

Conclusion

5. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeals should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice.

Siobhán Watson

INSPECTOR