



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 November 2025

by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/25/3374010

3 Creffield Road, Ealing W5 3HP

- 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 Adrian Lees against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 252317FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as the side extension to first floor studio flat and associated alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the:
 - character and appearance of the Ealing Common Conservation Area;
 - living conditions of the occupiers of 1 Creffield Road with specific regard to outlook, levels of natural light, and privacy; and
 - provision of cycle and waste storage.

Reasons

Character and appearance of the Conservation Area

3. The appeal site is located within the Ealing Common Conservation Area (the CA) wherein I have a statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area.
4. The Ealing Common Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) describes the area as being defined by the presence of Ealing Common and by the residential roads surrounding it. The properties comprising these roads are mainly Victorian and Edwardian in character and constructed of stock and red bricks laid in Flemish bond and pitched roofs covered with slate or tiles. As such, the significance of the CA as a heritage asset is both architectural and historic derived, in large part from the layout and materials of the built environment that enable appreciation of the area's history.
5. The appeal property forms part of a former single detached dwelling. The building appears large and imposing within the street scene with distinctive gables facing

the highway and architectural detailing such as the two chimney stacks within the first-floor side elevation further drawing the eye. The building benefits from a vertical form with a moderate gap with neighbouring buildings maintaining a spacious relationship indicative of the layout of other Victorian former single detached dwellings within the area. A flat roofed single storey side extension sits at odds with the host building, nonetheless its single storey form maintains a subservience to the host property and the separation with the neighbouring building at first floor level. As such, by virtue of its scale, form, architecture, and relationship with neighbouring buildings, the building and thus the appeal property as part of this, positively contributes to the character and appearance of the CA.

6. The proposed first-floor side extension would be highly visible from the street scene, projecting towards the neighbouring building, eroding the existing gap and visual separation with the surrounding built environment. This would harm the traditional spacious layout of such Victorian former single detached dwellings. Whilst there are examples within the area of a narrower gaps between buildings, these are in the minority and unusual for a building the size of the appeal property within the CA. The location of the proposal in combination with the existing ground floor side extension would create a notable two-storey form of development and, despite its one metre set back, would compete with the host dwelling and eroding its existing vertical form. The use of a half-hipped roof, matching materials, lower ridge height and smaller footprint than the host dwelling would fail to mitigate its effect on the existing spacious layout and vertical form of the existing building. Further, it would obscure one of the chimney stacks within the side elevation of the host building, harming this existing distinctive architectural feature. Thus, the proposal would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the CA and harms its significance as a heritage asset.
7. Given the scale of the proposal within the context of the CA as a whole, I consider the harm to its significance to be on the lower end of less than substantial. Nevertheless, Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) directs when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of the level of harm.
8. Paragraph 215 of the Framework states that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
9. The proposal would almost double the footprint of the appeal property, providing separate bedroom facilities. This would improve the living conditions of occupiers and the overall quality of the existing housing stock. Nevertheless, given the proposal is for the extension to a single existing dwelling, this benefit would carry limited weight and would not outweigh the harm to the significance of the CA as a heritage asset.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude the appeal development fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. As such, the development conflicts with the relevant provisions of Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan – the Spatial Strategy for Greater London (2021) (London Plan) and Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) (DPD). When read together these policies require development within Conservation Areas to retain and enhance characteristic features and detailing

and avoid the introduction of development that undermines the significance of the Conservation Area.

11. The proposal would additionally conflict with the Ealing Housing Design Guidance (2022) (EHDG) which, when read as a whole, requires new development to respond to their surroundings and enhance the character of the local neighbourhood.

Living conditions

12. 1 Creffield Road (no 1) is adjacent to the side elevation of the appeal property. There are two small windows within the upper floors of the side elevation of no 1 facing the side elevation of the appeal property. Given their small scale, outlook from these openings is narrowed to the side elevation of the appeal building limiting outlook. Their scale additionally limits levels of natural light they supply occupiers.
13. The proposal would project towards no 1 at first-floor level with two windows proposed within the side elevation. Whilst the proposal would be closer to the neighbouring windows, given the already limited levels of natural light and outlook they offer, the proposal would have a minor effect on these. Further, the two proposed side windows could be obscure glazed secured through condition and would therefore prevent any overlooking and loss of privacy.
14. As such, the proposal would be acceptable with regard to its effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of no 1 with specific regard to outlook, levels of natural light, and privacy. Accordingly, it would not conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan and 7.4 and 7B of the DPD. When read together these require development to deliver appropriate outlook, privacy, and good levels of daylight.
15. The proposal would additionally not conflict with the Ealing Housing Design Guidance (2022) (EHDG) which, when read as a whole, requires new development to not negatively impact the living conditions of neighbouring properties.

Cycle and waste storage

16. The Council reference Policies T5, T6, T6.1, and SI 8 of the London Plan which relate to cycle parking, car parking, and waste storage. Reading these policies as a whole it is clear that with regard to residential development they are applicable to new dwellings and not extensions to existing dwellings.
17. The proposal is for the extension to an existing studio flat and therefore would not involve the creation of a new dwelling. As such, I find no conflict with Policies T5, T6, T6.1, and SI 8 of the London Plan.
18. The Council reference Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Local Plan. These policies relate broadly to character and appearance, and living conditions respectively. As such, these are not relevant with regards to my assessment of the provision of cycle parking and waste storage as they relate to this appeal.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

N Unwin

INSPECTOR