

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2022

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/21/3280474

69 Mandeville Road, London UB5 4LX

- 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 Saadat Khan against the decision of London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 213335HH, dated 25 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of a canopy on front elevation of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit, I saw that a canopy had been installed. However, it differs from the proposal and for clarity, I have assessed the proposal based on the plans submitted with the application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property and other semi-detached dwellings located in this part of the street have two storey gable projections to the front. Although many have been altered, including the host dwelling, the appeal property and others, retain a rhythm of consistency in the street scene.
5. The proposed canopy would extend past the two-storey front projection of the original dwelling and due to this depth, in combination with the diameter of the pillars and bulk of the roof structure, it would appear as an unduly dominant feature on the front. In such a prominent location on a corner site, this striking feature would, in my view, unacceptably erode the architectural composition of the property as part of a pair.
6. The site lies outside of any Conservation Area, and I accept that on corner properties there are sometimes opportunities to create larger dwellings, in part due to the increased spaciousness. Moreover, the proposal would be subservient to the overall scale and massing of the building, and I recognise that the appellant has sought to reduce the size from the existing canopy. However, I am required to assess the proposal before me on its own merits and whilst the proposal would be an improvement from the existing canopy in

situ, these matters or the support from neighbours do not overcome my concerns regarding the design of the proposal before me.

7. There are other examples of canopies within the wider area. However, these are very much the minority and there are none in this part of the street scene. Moreover, those that I saw, served to confirm that the design of canopies can lead to unduly dominant additions which can harmfully alter the nature of the relationship between pairs of houses.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with the requirements of Policies 7B and 7.4 of the Council's Development Management Development Plan Document (2013) (DPD), Policies D1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) (LP), and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework. These stipulate, amongst other things, that development should compliment the existing built areas street scene, building pattern, scale, materials and detailing.
9. In conclusion, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR