Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2026

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 September 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/25/3358314
95 Greatdown Road, Hanwell, Ealing W7 1JR

- 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 Abdelhadi Hussein against the decision of Ealing Council.
- The application Ref is 243344HH.
- The development is described as a 'conservatory'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of the development as a 'conservatory' from the application form, although I note that its walls are predominantly constructed in masonry. The structure is already in place, and I have dealt with the appeal on the basis of its retention.

3. I have had regard to the revised National Planning Policy Framework which was published in August 2026 ('Framework'), rather than the now superceded version which was in place at the time of the Council's decision.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the development on:

   - The character and appearance of the host property and the area, including whether it preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Cuckoo Estate Conservation Area ('the CECA'); and

   - The living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at 93 and 97 Greatdown Road ('No 93' and 'No 97'), with particular regard to outlook, privacy and the availability of natural light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. Policy HE6 of the Framework says that when considering the potential effect of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, such as a conservation

area, substantial weight should be given to the asset's conservation. It continues that any harm to a designated heritage asset will be a matter of considerable importance, and that where a proposal would harm its significance, the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal.

6. The Cuckoo Estate Conservation Area Appraisal 2007 ('the CAA') describes the CECA as a surviving interwar London County Council estate, planned in a methodical manner along the lines of a traditional garden suburb, and which retains many of its original features and layout. It continues that the houses are typically two storeys high, and mostly arranged in small groups of terraces or semi-detached houses in an unadorned, but solid architectural style, and which are set back slightly from the tree-lined roads.

7. Amongst key issues and threats, the CAA, and the Cuckoo Estate Conservation Area Management Plan 2007 ('the MP') list overlarge and bulky rear extensions, which reduce the size of the garden; and that some new development does not attempt to use the scale, form or design cues from the estate.

8. The host sits within a short terrace, whose siting, form, style, materials and appearance in the streetscene are typical of the CECA. The proportions of its short pre-existing single storey rear extension were broadly similar to the adjacent single storey rear extensions at No 93 and No 97.

9. The development the subject of this appeal is attached to the host's pre-existing extension. As a result, based on the Council's calculation, extensions now project around 7.2 metres from the host's original rear face, and their combined depth is much greater than the extensions at No 93 and No 97. Consequently, notwithstanding its single storey height, the resultant development, which spans almost the entire width of the plot, has a significant scale which, combined with its flat-roofed, rectilinear form, gives it an awkward, bulky and crude appearance.

10. The development can only be glimpsed in the public realm through a gap to the side of 75 Bordars Road, but it is highly visible from many nearby properties, including No 93 and No 97. In those views, its bulk, form, scale and design appear incongruous, and it therefore harms the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

11. The appellant considers that porches in the CECA disfigure the outlook from houses and, given their prominence, the appearance of the street. However, I do not know the planning history of all such features, and most that I observed, are fairly modestly proportioned, and in keeping with the style of the house. In any event, the presence of front porches, does not justify the harmful impact of this large rear extension.

12. For these reasons, and having regard to the statutory test, the development fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CECA. In harming this part of the CECA, and the qualities which contribute to its significance, the scheme harms its character and appearance as a whole.

13. I have not been provided with the Generic Conservation Area Management Plan, or the Ealing Residential Housing Design Guidance, which are referred to in the Council's decision. However, the scheme conflicts with Policy 7C of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document 2013 ('EDMD'), as

referenced in the Council's delegated report, which sets out that development shall not undermine the significance of conservation areas, along with the advice in the CAA and the MP.

14. It also conflicts with the general requirement for high quality design, which complements existing detailing and scale, responds to local character and distinctiveness, and has a positive visual impact, in EDMD Policies 7B and 7.4, and London Plan 2021 ('LP') Policy D4.

Living conditions

15. Although the development extends well beyond the rear face of the extensions at No 93 and No 97, its impact on the outlook from those properties is tempered by its single storey height. Given its height and proportions, and that the principal glazed areas of No 93 and No 97 are set in from those plots' side boundaries, I am not persuaded from the evidence before me that the development has resulted in a significant loss of natural light for those occupiers.

16. However, the development includes long runs of side-facing windows, some of which can be opened. Those windows are situated very close to the plot's side boundaries, and at a height largely above the boundary fences. Having regard to representations by interested parties, given their position, and notwithstanding the use of obscure glazing, they have resulted in a significant perception of overlooking and loss of privacy, as well as light intrusion in the hours of darkness. Those impacts are particularly harmful given that the neighbouring gardens are short or narrow, and that those parts of gardens closest to a house are typically most intensively used, including for sitting out and relaxing.

17. The development has therefore caused significant harm to the living conditions at No 93 and No 97. It therefore conflicts with EDMD Policy 7B, which sets out that new development must achieve a high standard of amenity for adjacent uses, having regard to matters including privacy; and with the broad approach in LP Policy D6 for high quality design, which maximises the usability of outside amenity space.

Other matters

18. The appellant raises concerns regarding the time and expense involved in making a retrospective planning application when the outcome was a refusal of permission. He continues that neighbours were initially supportive of the proposal, and that changes could be made to the development. However, it is unclear whether neighbours were aware of the design and size of the proposed 'conservatory' before it was built, and I have no details of any suggested changes that could be made to it. I have therefore dealt with the scheme before me on its planning merits.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

19. I have found that the scheme has resulted in unacceptable living conditions for the occupants of No 93 and No 97; and that it has harmed the character and appearance of the host property and the area, including the significance of the CECA.

20. In accordance with the Framework, the harm to this designated heritage asset is a matter of considerable importance. I have not been directed to any public benefits arising from the development, and I consider that any benefits are largely restricted

to the occupants' own living conditions. Consequently, the scheme also conflicts with Framework Policy HE6.

21. The scheme conflicts with the development plan, and material considerations, including the Framework, do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR