



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 8 September 2021

by R Sabu BA(Hons), MA, BArch, PgDip, RIBA, ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/W/21/3269905

25 Mandeville Road, Northolt UB5 5HF

- 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 Mr Lulzim Krasniqi of LULU Properties Limited against the decision of London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 204671FUL, dated 11 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is construction of a 2 storey, part 3 storey, building to accommodate 4 self-contained flats (following demolition of existing bungalow).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Lulzim Krasniqi of LULU Properties Limited against London Borough of Ealing. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matter

3. Since Part E of the Appeal Form indicates that the description of development has been changed, I have used the description stated in the appeal form and decision notice in the header above.

Main Issue

4. The appellant submitted revised drawings as part of the appeal which indicate altered internal layouts. Since the changes would not modify the external fabric of the building, they would not prejudice consultees of the opportunity to comment. I have therefore had regard to the updated drawings in my assessment. The Council has indicated that the drawings address the second reason for refusal. From the evidence before me, I see no reason to disagree.
5. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area including whether it would preserve or enhance the significance of Northolt Village Green Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

6. The existing building is a semi-detached single storey dwelling and is located adjacent a number of other semi-detached buildings. To the other side lies a church with a tall tower and a pitched roof, the ridge of which extends to around three storeys in height while the eaves lie above the second storey.

While there are three storey buildings in the wider area, and the site may be part of Northolt Neighbourhood Centre, given the form of the existing building and the close proximity to the adjacent semi-detached dwellings, the site has a closer relationship to these single storey buildings than the three storey ones in the wider area. As such, the single storey dwellings offer a spacious character and appearance to the area while the church provides an attractive focal point.

7. The proposal includes the demolition of the existing building and the erection of a part two storey, part three storey block of four flats. The scheme would be taller than and have a significantly larger massing than the existing semi-detached building. It would therefore significantly diminish the spacious quality of the area.
8. I acknowledge the various heights, projections and setbacks of the proposed scheme. However, the flat roofs and rectangular forms would appear discordant against the more domestic pitched roof forms of the semi-detached dwellings. While the proposal would appear to be a similar height as the ridge of the church building, given its flat roof and height significantly above the eaves level of the church, the form would be in harmony with neither the dwelling to one side, nor the church building on the other.
9. Therefore, while the loss of the bungalow and contemporary style of the proposal would not necessarily harm the character of the area, the proposal would unacceptably diminish the spacious character of the area and have a discordant effect on the street scene.
10. The site lies adjacent to the CA, the significance of which lies in the evidence of historic architecture. Given the distance from the site to the more historic parts of the CA, the proposal would not harm its setting or significance.
11. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would conflict with Policies 7B and 7.4 of the Development Management Development Plan Document Adopted December 2013 which seek high quality architecture and development that complement the building pattern of existing built areas among other things.
12. It would also conflict with the aims of Policies D1 and D4 of The London Plan The Spatial Development Strategy For Greater London March 2021 (London Plan) which seek, among other things, developments that respect the character of an area and deliver good design. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework in this respect.

Other Matters

13. I acknowledge the evidence regarding the sustainability of the location and that the scheme would be built by a local house builder. I also note the other London Plan Policies cited by the appellant and the corresponding evidence including that small sites can make an important contribution to meeting housing requirements and the importance of intensifying the use of suitable sites for housing.
14. The scheme would contribute three dwellings to the local housing supply. In addition, future occupiers would contribute economic and social benefits to the local community and there would be temporary economic benefits during the construction stage. However, given the harm to the character and appearance of the area, these matters have not altered my overall decision.

15. I note the comments of the Inspector for the scheme at No 35 Mandeville Road. However, that development is in a different location to the appeal scheme and is therefore not directly comparable in terms of character and appearance. In any event, each case must be determined on its individual merits.
16. I note the concerns regarding the service provided by the Council. However, I have necessarily determined the application based on its planning merits and this matter has not altered my overall decision.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would conflict with the development plan as a whole and in the absence of material considerations to indicate otherwise, the appeal is dismissed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR