
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2025

by **F P Tinsley MA (Hons) MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/25/3374412

19 Ashridge Court, Redcroft Road, Southall, Ealing UB1 3PA

- 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 by Ms Nayia Rasool against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application reference is Ref: 244107FUL
 - The development proposed is 'Erection of infill to provide x4 2-bedroom residential units following the demolition of existing infill'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, particularly with regard to height;
 - Whether the transport impacts of the development would be acceptable, with regard to cycle storage provision and the proposed crossover; and
 - Whether adequate waste-storage facilities would be provided on site.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is located in an approximately central position between two three-storey terraces of residential flats forming part of a housing estate typical of mid-twentieth-century local authority development. The terraces are relatively uniform in appearance, with shallow pitched roofs and generally consistent façade materials and fenestration. The elongated blocks are utilitarian in character and form part of a wider composition with the adjacent Birkdale Court and the opposing Peebles Court and Verulam Court, which front onto a central play area. The wider area contains buildings of varying heights, including four-storey maisonette developments and substantially taller residential blocks exceeding ten storeys in height.
4. The appeal site is occupied by a single-storey dwelling which mirrors the single-storey dwelling opposite, located between Peebles Court and Verulam Court. Both this lower-rise dwelling and the similarly low-built form on the appeal

site punctuate and break up the otherwise linear arrangement of surrounding development, reducing its perceived mass and uniformity. This creates a particularly positive effect on the amenity and play area positioned between the two broadly parallel terraces, lessening the sense of enclosure.

5. The proposal is for a four-storey building replacing the existing single-storey dwelling. The new building would be predominantly flat-roofed and would rise 3.15 metres above the eaves level and 1.7 metres above the ridge height of the surrounding blocks. It would also project markedly beyond both the front and rear elevations of the adjacent terraces and would incorporate balconies and elevational treatments that differ significantly from the character of surrounding development.
6. The proposal would introduce a distinctly contrasting architectural form into the streetscape. Although the juxtaposition of styles would mean the appeal site continues to read as a visual break between adjoining terraces, the overall massing of the proposal, together with the existing development, would be substantial and harmful to the streetscene. This harm would be intensified significantly by the increased height of the building and its pronounced forward and rearward projections beyond the established building line. The result would be a development that appears overly dominant and incongruous in the context of the surrounding three-storey terraces, notwithstanding the presence of taller buildings elsewhere in the wider area. I do not consider that the proposal would create an attractive or distinctive place.
7. The proposal would also have a particularly dominating impact on the amenity area and play space to the east of the appeal site. By removing the existing break between the terraces above ground-floor level, the development would detract from the setting of this amenity area and create a significantly increased sense of enclosure. This is likely to be detrimental to the use and enjoyment of the space.
8. In summary, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to height and would therefore conflict with Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021), and Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) (DMDPD). These policies support the efficient use of land while requiring development to deliver good design that complements local character and has a positive visual impact, taking account of street sequence, building pattern and scale. The Council has also referred to London Plan Policy HC1 and DMDPD Policy 7C, which relate to heritage matters; however, I have not been directed to any wording within these policies that would be directly engaged by the proposal, and they have therefore not been determinative. I have also not afforded weight to the emerging Ealing Plan Policy DAA identified by the Council.

Transportation

9. The appeal site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 3, indicating moderate access to public transport. A total of three off-site parking spaces are proposed, including one disabled parking space accessed via a pavement crossover. This crossover is deemed unacceptable as it exceeds the maximum permissible width of 2.4 metres. The appellant has indicated a willingness to amend the proposal; however, no revised details have been provided. As such, it is not possible to determine whether an amended

arrangement would be acceptable in highway terms, particularly regarding pedestrian safety and appropriate access to the parking area.

10. The highway authority has identified that the proposed cycle parking area is inadequate due to its size and its location adjacent to the disabled parking space. Although the appellant suggests that this matter could be resolved by condition, I am not satisfied, based on the information provided, that an adequately sized and suitably positioned cycle storage area could be accommodated on site within the constraints of its layout, scale, and the need to provide vehicular parking. In these circumstances, it would be unreasonable to address this matter by condition.
11. For the above reasons, I find that the proposal fails to accord with Policies T3, T4 and T5 of the London Plan (2021), the London Cycling Design Standards (2014), and the Vehicle Crossovers: Application Pack for Residents (2021). Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that proposals are acceptable in terms of highway safety and that they encourage sustainable modes of travel, particularly cycling. The transport impacts of the development would not be acceptable with regard to cycle storage provision and provision of a crossover.

Waste Storage

12. Policy SI 7 of the London Plan (2021) states that development proposals should include adequate, flexible, and easily accessible storage space and collection systems that support, as a minimum, the separate collection of dry recyclables (including card, paper, mixed plastics, metals, and glass) and food waste.
13. The appellant has not challenged the Council's determination that the development would require four 240-litre bins. However, no details regarding the location of the proposed waste and recycling bins have been provided within the application submission.
14. The appellant has suggested that this matter could be addressed by means of a planning condition, allowing the details to be agreed with the Council at a later stage. They indicate that bin storage could be integrated within the site layout. However, given that the front forecourt is proposed to accommodate three car parking spaces and cycle storage, it is not apparent that sufficient space would remain to house the necessary refuse and recycling bins for the proposed units. In the absence of adequate waste-storage provision, the proposal conflicts with Policy SI 7 of the London Plan (2021) as adequate waste storage facilities would not be provided on site.

Other Matters

15. The principle of residential development at the site is not in dispute and there is considerable support for boosting the supply of housing. The proposed development would make a positive contribution to the supply of housing in the area on a small windfall site that the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) recognises are often built out relatively quickly. This benefit attracts significant positive weight in my determination.

Conclusion

16. The proposal would contribute to the supply of housing in the area, and I afford this significant weight in my determination. However, the harm I have identified in relation to the character and appearance of the area, arising primarily from the

height of the development, attracts substantial weight. This harm, together with the harm relating to inadequate cycle storage, the highway safety implications of the proposed crossover, and insufficient waste-storage provision, results in the proposal conflicting with the development plan when read as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the Framework, that indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

F P Tinsley

INSPECTOR