
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2020

by Jan Hebblethwaite MA Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/20/3249067

45 Ruislip Road, Greenford UB6 9QD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made Mr I Chaudry against the decision of the London Borough of Ealing Council.
 - The application Ref 194210HH dated 20 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is to increase the bedrooms to the existing house from 5 bedrooms to 8 bedrooms with an additional level. The additional level is to match a current application in height to No. 43 Ruislip Road with a design to match No 43. Proposed development to include a basement.
-

Procedural matter

1. The application form described the proposed development as set out in the banner heading above. The decision notice described the proposed development as:

Creation of basement level; creation of an additional level to dwelling house with three-storey side/rear extension, three storey side/front extension; side, front and rear roof extensions; internal reconfiguration of dwelling house to accommodate a total of 8 bedrooms; and associated car parking, refuse and cycle storage area.

I am satisfied that the description on the decision notice reflects the proposed development shown on the application plans.

2. Some of the plans submitted with the appeal appear to have the same numbers but with different content. A request was sent to the Appellant's agent for clarification, but no reply was received. Therefore, I have determined this appeal on the basis of the following plans, namely:

Plan No	Date	Description on plan and what is shown on the plan
PL01	-	"Existing site location"
PL02	Nov 2017	"Existing Information" – shows existing ground floor layout and elevations
PL03	Nov 2017	"Existing Information" – shows existing ground, first and loft room floor plans

Plan No	Date	Description on plan and what is shown on the plan
PL10	Feb 2019	"Proposed Information" – shows proposed basement and ground floor plans
PL10	Aug 2019	"Existing and Proposed" – shows existing street elevations from 31-57 (odd) Ruislip Road; existing street elevations 39-47 (odd) Ruislip Road; approved proposals street elevation 31-57 (odd) Ruislip Road, and approved proposals street elevations 39-47 (odd) Ruislip Road
PL11	Feb 2019	"Proposed Information" – shows proposed first and second floor plans
PL11	Aug 2019	"Proposed Information" – shows street elevations (31-57 (odd) with proposed additional levels at 43 and 45 and a series of photos relating to height differences
PL12	Feb 2019	"Proposed Information" – shows proposed third floor and roof plans
PL13	Feb 2019	"Proposed Information" – shows proposed elevations; the front and rear elevations shown with the basement and without
PL15	Feb 2019	"Proposed Information" – shows front elevation of 43 and 45 with respective proposed alterations
PL16	Feb 2019	"Proposed Information" – shows the proposed front elevations of 43 Ruislip Road and the proposed front elevation of 45 Ruislip Road with basement levels.

Decision

- The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

- The main issue in this appeal is the impact of the proposed development on the visual amenity of the street scene in Ruislip Road and on the character of the area.

Reasons

- The appeal property is an imposing detached house, fronting onto a busy road. The immediate area on the same side of the road is residential in character with a variety of styles and sizes of dwelling, although they appear to be of a similar age. On the day of my site visit, the adjoining property at 43 was behind hoardings although the upper level was visible. It appeared that redevelopment of that property was well underway.
- Planning permission for conversion of the appeal property into 8 flats has been granted previously¹, the permitted elevations being as shown on Plan PL10 Aug

¹ 183740FUL

2019. Planning permission for the conversion of the adjoining property at 43 has also been granted, as shown on the same plan.
6. The elevation plans submitted with the appeal show three different scenarios, namely the existing properties from 31-57 Ruislip Road, the elevations of 43 and 45 if the extant planning permissions were to be implemented and the elevations of 43, if a pending application were to be approved and 45 if the current appeal were to be allowed.
 7. The difference between the street elevation of the appeal property and its neighbour as they would be under the approved permissions and under the respective proposals can be seen by comparing the bottom elevation on plan PL10 Aug 2019 and the lowest elevation on plan PL11 Aug 2019. In both cases, the difference is the addition of an extra storey.
 6. The Council Officer's report records that an application for development at 43 to create an additional storey was first rejected in July 2019 and an appeal was dismissed in February 2020. A second application was refused on 24 October 2019, which post-dated the submission of the application now at appeal. Therefore, Plan PL11 does not accurately reflect the development which has been authorised to take place at 43.
 7. The London Plan (March 2016) at Policy 7.4 requires development to have regard to the scale mass and orientation of surrounding buildings. Buildings should be of high quality in design, including in relation to scale proportion and mass. Policy 7.6B requires that buildings should be of a proportion, composition, scale and orientation that enhances, activates and appropriately defines the public realm.
 8. Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that development should be sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.
 9. The proposed development would create a building with significantly more bulk and mass than that authorised by the extant permission for the appeal property. The building would also be considerably more imposing than neighbouring properties, including 43 as redeveloped under its extant permission.
 10. The Appellant has submitted Plan PL11 Aug 2019 which shows that the ridge height for 43 and 45 under their respective proposed developments would match. The plan also shows the difference between those ridge heights and that at 41, a traditional semi-detached dwelling. That difference would be 1.998m. Plan PL11 Aug 2019 provides examples of other buildings in Ealing with roof heights which are different to their neighbours.
 11. However, those comparisons are unhelpful now that the proposed development of 43 with the additional storey has been rejected. A better comparison is shown on Plan PL10 Aug 2019, which indicates that the roof heights of 43 and 45 under their respective extant permissions would be in keeping with neighbouring properties.
 12. The Development Plan policies seek to ensure that development respects the scale and mass of surrounding buildings. The extant permission at the appeal property would result in a larger building but one which does respect the character of the area and the street scene. The appeal development would

create a significantly more imposing building which would be out of character and would be overbearing in the street scene. For those reasons, I consider that the appeal proposal would be harmful to the street scene and to the character of the area and as a result would conflict with the Development Plan policies.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jan Hebblethwaite

INSPECTOR