



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2022

By A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/22/3307465

69 Mandeville Road Northolt Middlesex 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 The London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref: 222012HH dated 10 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 December 2022.
 - The development is installation of roof canopy over porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The drawings Ref: 1078/DJ/02 provided as existing floor plan and front and side elevation does not represent the position found on the date of the site visit (SV), this is explained by the Council's report which refers to an unauthorised full width canopy and an enforcement investigation resulting in the application which is the subject of this appeal. At the date of the site visit, the full width canopy appearing on that drawing had been curtailed to a roofed porch and entrance doors in wood-effect UPVC. I have determined this matter on the basis of my observations at the site visit.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. No.69 Mandeville Road (No.69) is an extended two storey semi-detached dwelling situated at the junction with Carr Road in a suburban area. Mandeville Road is a busy tree-lined urban road dominated by semi-detached houses with foregardens that overlook public open space on the opposite side of the road. Neighbouring properties present differing surface treatments, hedged boundaries and shrub planting, nevertheless, conveying a degree of consistency in setting and use of materials.
5. No.69 has been subject to changes which stand in unsympathetic contrast to its surroundings, presenting a wholly paved forecourt enclosed by perimeter walling painted in a strident colour. The brickwork of the house has also been overpainted. Overall the appeal site is visually discordant with its adjoining paired house, lacking the calm and even character of the surrounding area.

6. What is proposed intends to encase the existing porch with a canopy, projecting further forward to be supported by pillars. However, the manner in which this is to be achieved is far from clear on the drawings submitted. The drawings do not represent the size and position of the fenestration with any reasonable degree of accuracy such that, to my mind, any 'plans' condition would be meaningless and unenforceable to the degree which would be necessary to achieve a satisfactory appearance.
7. Even if these difficulties were absent, the suggested tiled roof to the canopy would likely be undeliverable due to the dimensional discrepancies and lack of adequate slope in the proposed tiled surface. Any attempt to implement what appears on the submitted drawings would, in my view, appear visually incoherent and tend to increase the obtrusive character of the appeal site. I therefore conclude that the proposal would fail to accord with the objectives set out in policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management DPD (2013) which seek to protect the character of streets and their visual amenity.
8. Taking all matters raised into account I conclude the proposal would thereby conflict with the development plan taken as a whole and, in consequence, the appeal cannot succeed.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR