



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2025

by Ryan Cowley MPlan (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/25/3371076

52A Studley Grange Road, Hanwell, Ealing W7 2LX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr William Murphy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 250701OUT.
 - The development proposed is construction of a one and a half storey dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was made in outline with all matters reserved for future consideration. The submitted plans and supporting information however provide details of access, appearance, layout and scale. These details are not indicated to be for illustrative purposes, and so I have considered them as part of the proposed development to which the appeal relates.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area;
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular regard to outlook;
 - Whether the proposal would provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers, with particular regard to its access, private amenity space provision and natural light; and
 - Whether the proposal would provide adequate cycle and bin storage.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. While there are some commercial uses in the vicinity, the area surrounding the appeal site is predominantly residential in nature, comprised mostly of 2-storey traditional terraced and semi-detached dwellings. The streets are linear, and houses typically sit close to the footpath behind modest front gardens. Many properties however feature elongated rear garden spaces.

5. I saw on my site visit that development to the rear of dwellings is not uncommon, though tends to be in the form of garden outbuildings and other incidental structures. While there are some local examples of dwellings set back from the road behind existing houses, including at 75b and 77c Studley Grange Road, this form of development is not a prevailing feature of the area.
6. The appeal site comprises a modestly sized parcel of land to the rear of 52A Studley Grange Road, accessed via a narrow pedestrian walkway between 2 existing dwellings and enclosed by a combination of tall timber fences and blockwork walls. Though to the rear of existing residential properties, the site does not form part of an existing garden. It currently features an abandoned outbuilding which, though in a dilapidated state, is similar in scale and appearance to a garden outbuilding and remains a subservient feature at the rear of the existing dwellings.
7. The proposed development would replace the existing structure with a detached 1.5 storey dwelling. It would have an appreciably higher ridge height and include accommodation in the roof space. The roof plane itself would be almost vertical, accentuating the height of the dwelling. In the context of the modestly sized plot in which it is situated, the development would appear cramped, abutting the site boundaries on 3 sides, with only a modest gap to the other boundaries. Its constrained character would be emphasised by the narrow, elongated pedestrian access to it and modest private amenity space.
8. In views from Bostonthorpe Road, the area to the rear of the existing dwellings on Studley Grange Road remains characterised by the mature vegetation and trees that project above the fence line and span the gap between opposing rear elevations. The proposal would be a conspicuous and incongruous addition to this area, standing higher than the neighbouring garden outbuildings and garages and eroding the sense of space between the back-to-back rows of houses.
9. The proposal would thus have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area. It would conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document Adopted 10 December 2013 (the DM DPD); Policy 3.8 of the Development Strategy 2026 Development Plan Document Adopted 3 April 2012 (the DS DPD) and Policies D3, D4 and D6 of the London Plan March 2021. These policies, among other provisions, seek to protect residential suburban character, and ensure that development complements street sequence, building pattern and scale; has a positive visual impact with high quality architecture and design; provides appropriate levels of development on site; enhances local context; and meets the design requirements of the London Plan.
10. In respect of this main issue, I have not identified any direct conflict with Policies 1.1(e) or 1.1(i) of the DS DPD, referred to in the decision notice. This policy sets out the spatial vision for Ealing including to be a healthy and safe place to live and protecting and enhancing the pattern of green spaces and green corridors.

Living conditions of neighbours

11. The appeal site wraps around 2 sides of the rear garden area indicated on the submitted block plan to be associated with the neighbouring flat at 52A Studley Grange Road (referred to by the Council as 52B Studley Grange Road). This private amenity space is very modest in size and enclosed by a high timber fence.

12. The proposed dwelling would project considerably higher than the boundary fence. It would be set back from it slightly at ground floor however the cantilever roof section would extend up to the shared boundary. Its proximity and height would appear unduly overbearing and oppressive from this neighbouring garden space, and thus it would have a deleterious effect on its outlook. There is no evidence to indicate the users of this area have any alternative private amenity space provision. The harm to outlook from the development for users of this space would thus have a harmful effect on their living conditions.
13. The Council did not identify harm to other neighbouring properties, subject to planning conditions. Given the separation distances to other neighbouring properties, there is no compelling reason for me to conclude otherwise.
14. Nevertheless, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the users of the garden space adjoining the site, with particular regard to outlook. It would thus conflict with Policy 7B of the DM DPD and Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan. These policies, among other provisions, seek to ensure that new development delivers appropriate outlook; maximises the usability of outside amenity space, with outdoor environments that are comfortable and inviting for people to use; and achieves a high standard of amenity for adjacent uses, including by ensuring appropriate levels of development on site and positive visual impact. In respect of this main issue, I have not identified any direct conflict with Policies 1.1(e) or 1.1(i) of the DS DPD.

Living conditions for future occupiers

15. Given the constrained nature of the site, the ground floor of the proposed dwelling would feature windows in the front elevation only. Views from the kitchen window and reception room glazed doors would be dominated by the boundary fencing and dwellings opposite, due to the limited separation distances. First-floor windows would be glazed with opaque glass to protect the privacy of neighbours. There would thus be very restricted outlook from the proposed dwelling, and natural light levels to ground floor rooms would be limited.
16. The site would continue to be accessed via a narrow, elongated pedestrian alleyway, shared with the 2 adjacent flats. Combined with the poor outlook and light levels, this would also create an oppressive environment for future occupiers both inside the dwelling and when entering or exiting the site.
17. Policy D6 of the London Plan stipulates that a minimum of 5 square metres (sqm) of private outdoor space should be provided for 1-2 person dwellings, and an extra 1sqm for each additional occupant. The proposed private amenity space would exceed this requirement. The Council contend that dwellinghouses should be provided with at least 50sqm of private amenity space, however I have not been directed to any local policies or guidance that stipulate this. I am thus satisfied that the proposal would provide an adequate amount of private amenity space.
18. While I have found that the proposal would provide adequate private amenity space provision, the proposed development would nevertheless fail to provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers, with particular regard to its access, and natural light. It would therefore be contrary to Policies 7A and 7B of the DM DPD and Policies D3, D4 and D6 of the London Plan, which seeks to ensure that housing development is of high-quality design and provides adequately sized rooms with comfortable and functional layouts and sufficient daylight and sunlight.

Cycle and bin storage

19. The plans before me depict cycle parking and bin storage towards the rear of the site, underneath the cantilever roof section. Manoeuvring bikes and bins into this area is likely to be difficult given the limited space. Nevertheless, there would remain enough space elsewhere within the site to accommodate bin storage and cycle parking were this deemed impractical.
20. The Council has raised concerns however that the width of the pedestrian access into the site would not be of adequate width to accommodate access for bicycles or refuse and recycling. While I recognise the existing access is narrow, I saw on my site visit that it would be wide enough for a pedal bike or bin to pass through.
21. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would provide adequate cycle and bin storage. It would not conflict with Policies T3, T5, SI7 and SI8 of the London Plan. These policies, among other provisions, seek to ensure that development decisions and proposals support the active transport system; remove barriers to cycling, including securing appropriate levels of cycle parking, which is fit for purpose, secure and well-located; and provide for adequate, flexible and easily accessible storage space and collection systems for waste and recyclables.

Other Matters

22. The development would contribute to the local housing supply in an existing urban area with associated access to local services, public transport and amenities. It would provide a temporary economic boost during construction, and the additional residents may contribute to the vitality and viability of the community. The appellant maintains that it would also reuse previously developed land. Nevertheless, these benefits would be relatively modest given the scale and context of the development, and insufficient to outweigh the identified harm.
23. Other than where set out above, I have not identified conflict with any other relevant parts of the development plan or national policy and guidance. However, the absence of harm or development plan conflict with respect to other relevant matters weighs neither for nor against the proposal.

Conclusion

24. I have found that the proposed development would provide adequate cycle and bin storage. However, this would not overcome the identified harm and development plan conflict arising from the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area, the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, and the failure to provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers.
25. The proposed development would thus conflict with the development plan, taken as a whole. I have found no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Consequently, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Ryan Cowley

INSPECTOR