



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2025

by **B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/25/3374840

107 Kennedy Road, Hanwell, W7 1JW.

- 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 Mrs Ploy Jeana Li against the decision of Ealing Council.
 - The application Ref is 251702HH.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a side extension to create new ground floor habitable rooms and first floor bedrooms.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Planning Issues

2. The main issue is the effect the proposed development would have on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the local street scene in the context of the surrounding Cuckoo Estate Conservation Area (CA). There is also an issue of privacy at the neighbouring property, No 105 Kennedy Road.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The proposed extension would be set back from the front building line and down from the roof ridge so as to appear duly subordinate to its host, whilst also being of similar style, construction and finish. It would leave a garden area of reasonable size within the triangular corner plot. I therefore regard the inherent design of the extension to be acceptable in itself.
4. Importantly however, the surrounding area of the Cuckoo Estate CA is characterised by regular brick-built terraces of hipped roof houses, invariably with distinct gaps between them, despite a range of side extensions to some of the original end dwellings.
5. The terrace which includes the appeal property is no exception to this development pattern. It is situated at the end of a short cul-de-sac off the main part of Kennedy Road, with other terraces in a rectangular layout around a central green. From there, and from the Road itself, the end terrace it is visually separated from the neighbouring terraces by clear gaps between the appeal dwelling at No107 and No105 and between Nos 113 and 115. This regular layout and development pattern is an important feature of the urban grain of the CA.

6. Due to the width and bulk of the proposed extension to No 107, the important gap separating it from No105 would be closed when seen from most surrounding viewpoints, and from within the street scene especially. Moreover, the terrace as a whole would appear unbalanced.
7. I consider that this effect would harm both the character and appearance of the CA as a whole, failing in the duty of preservation set by planning law. In terms of national policy this would result in less than substantial harm to the CA as a designated heritage asset, without compensatory public benefits.

Privacy

8. There is also concern that the front windows of the side extension to No 107 would face the side of No105. However, the Council concedes, and I agree, that the privacy of No 105 could be safeguarded by a condition requiring obscure glazing to the front bathroom and study windows of the extension.

Conclusions

9. However, the adverse impact of the extension on the Cuckoo Estate CA would place the development into unacceptable conflict with adopted Ealing Development Management Policies 7.4 and 7C, as well as Policies D1, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan. Together, and consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, these policies require new development to complement the building pattern and retain the characteristic features of conservation areas by high quality design.
10. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR