



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 17 October 2023

by **G Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 May 2024

Appeal A Ref: APP/A5270/C/22/3305607

Appeal B Ref: APP/A5270/C/22/3305608

Premises known as 1A & 1B Northcote Avenue, Southall, Ealing UB1 2AX

- The appeals are made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
- Appeal A is made by Mr Bilhar Sidhu (GK & BS Sidhu Properties Limited) and Appeal B is made by Mrs Gurpal Sidhu against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
- The notice was issued on 19 July 2022.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission: The erection of a first floor infill extension and the raising of the roof height of an existing first floor extension.
- The requirements of the notice are:
 - A. Demolish and remove the first floor infill extension the approximate location of which is shown hatched and marked 'X' on the attached plan;
 - B. Lower the roof height of the existing first floor extension to the level prior to the unauthorised extension works taking place, the approximate location of which is shown hatched and marked 'Y' on the attached plan; and
 - C. Remove all resulting materials, rubbish and debris from the land.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is:
Three months.
- Appeals A and B are proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(f) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). In addition, Appeal A is proceeding on the ground set out in section 174(2)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made in respect of Appeal A under section 177(5) of the Act.

Summary Decisions: Appeals A and B are dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld with a variation in the terms set out below in the Formal Decisions.

Appeal C Ref: APP/A5270/W/22/3312492

1 Northcote Avenue, Ealing, Southall UB1 2AX

- 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 B Sidhu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
- The application Ref 223649FUL and dated 21 August 2022 was refused by notice dated 14 October 2022.
- The development proposed was described as 'Alterations of existing first floor addition to the rear to accommodate 2 additional flats'.

Summary Decision: The appeal is dismissed.

Formal Decisions

Appeals A and B

1. It is directed that the enforcement notice is varied by:
 - 1) The deletion of the words '...within three months...' and substitution with the words '...within six months...' from the final sentence of section '5. What you are required to do' of the notice.

2. Subject to the variation, Appeals A and B are dismissed, the enforcement notice is upheld and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

Appeal C

3. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for an award of costs

4. An application for an award of costs was made by the Council of the London Borough of Ealing against GK & BS Sidhu Properties Limited in respect of appeal A. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

5. Appeals A and B were initially made on grounds (a), (f) and (g) but it has subsequently been confirmed that the fee for the application deemed to have been made under ground (a) was paid only in respect of Appeal A. The banner heading above sets this out and I have determined the appeals accordingly.
6. The Council has queried the extent of the appellants' interest in the appeal site citing available Land Registry documents. However, I am satisfied that the quoted names given by the appellants on the appeal form and planning application form are sufficiently consistent across Appeals A, B and C for the appeals to proceed accordingly.
7. With regard to area 'Y', the appellants suggest that this area had 'already existed for several years'¹, a suggestion that could be taken to amount to a hidden ground (d) appeal; that at the time the notice was issued no action could be taken in respect of the alleged breach by reason of the passage of time. However, it is clear from the Council's photographic records, chronology and a comparison of front elevation photographs over time, that the roofline of area 'Y' has risen relative to identifiable datum points on the appeal building and the neighbouring building. The appellants have not set out an alternative timeline that would support their statement or challenge the Council's evidence. Thus, hidden ground (d) appeals fail for these reasons.
8. The appeal site has a lengthy and complex planning history which reflects the property's incremental growth and alteration over an extended period of time. The operational development enforced against in the current instance essentially relates to two areas of the building, helpfully annotated on the plan accompanying the notice as area 'X' and area 'Y'. The appellants' drawing reference 'GK3' also usefully sets out the extent of areas 'X' and 'Y', with area 'X' being the two rooms between 'flat 1D' and the office space at the rear, and the area 'Y' being that which the notice alleges the roof height has been increased.
9. The Council has also suggested in its submissions that there are other instances of operational development at the appeal property that do not benefit from planning permission. I am satisfied however that from the description of the alleged breach, the notice's requirements in respect of each area and the content of the plan, the matters before me can be clearly determined and considered accordingly and I have limited my consideration to those matters. It

¹ Paragraph 2.3 appellants' 'Grounds of Appeal'

remains within the appellants' gift to apply to have the lawfulness of the existing building and uses determined under sections 191 or 192 of the Act, and thus such matters are not before me in the current instance. Any such matter would be unaffected by determination of this matter.

10. Nevertheless, it is clear that the development as enforced against, and for which the application deemed to have been made under ground (a) seeks permission, differs from that to be considered under Appeal C. Thus, the scheme set out at Appeal C proposes the creation of two flats² and the enlargement of an existing flat (flat '1D')³ by way of works and alterations to the areas referred to in Appeals A and B as areas 'X' and 'Y'.
11. The appellants also cite the Appeal C scheme (also referred to as the 'second application') as an alternative scheme in their submissions in relation to the ground (f) appeals (Appeals A and B). Section 177(1) of the Act provides that planning permission may be granted 'in relation to the whole or any part of those matters' being enforced against. However, whereas the notice alleges the construction of extensions and alterations to the two named parts of the appeal building, the cited alternative (Appeal C / the 'second application') is specifically for the creation of additional residential units as well as various works to the appeal building. I am not therefore persuaded that this may reasonably be considered as an 'alternative' scheme to be 'part of those matters' for the purposes of s177(1). Nor have I been presented with any further details of a 'third application', the existence of which the Council questions.
12. Although the main issues are broadly consistent between the appeals, because of the differences between the schemes, and a third reason for refusal in relation to the Appeal C scheme, I will consider the matters separately as set out below. Despite the slight differences between the appeal site addresses given in relation to the notice (Appeals A and B) and the application for planning permission (Appeal C), I am satisfied that they relate to the same property. I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Appeal A

The appeal on ground (a)

Main Issues

13. The main issues are the effects of the appeal scheme upon:
 - The character and appearance of the appeal property and site and the surrounding area; and
 - The living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular regard to outlook, daylight and sunlight and privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

14. The appeal property is a detached two storey property located at the end of a terraced street of similar scale and proportions. At the side there lies a

² Flat '1L' and '1M' within areas 'X' and 'Y', respectively

³ As shown on drwg no: 02PR Rev B

forecourt that appears to provide access to the side and rear of 1a and 1b Northcote Avenue and also to the rears of commercial properties that front The Broadway / Uxbridge Road.

15. The Council's photographic evidence and chronology of the site's planning history demonstrate the changes that have been made to the building over time. From an internal and external viewing, the various iterations of the building through extension and alteration can be clearly discerned and more easily understood.
16. Thus, previously the appeal building featured a two-storey flat roofed rear extension with a smaller single storey lean-to side extension, behind which there was a mix of single storey, flat-roofed outbuildings of varying heights and styles. Over time, these elements have been subsumed incrementally by further additions, extensions and alterations to the building at roof level, culminating in the building and structures now before me.
17. Of the two areas cited in the notice as being subject to its requirements, area 'X' is the area, at first floor level, between the rear of the pre-existing two-storey extension and the office space shown on the submitted plans⁴, and extending sideways beyond the main building's gable elevation. Charitably, the extension could be described as being crudely constructed. From the street view at the front, the upper floor elevation is constituted of poorly laid, white painted blockwork. Along its flank elevation, white upvc cladding has been hung in two distinct and not entirely flush sections, with untidy and ramshackle finishes between ground and first floor, and at eaves level.
18. In isolation, this element of area 'X' is incongruous and jarringly out of keeping with the plain and unexceptional, yet reasonably pleasant, street-side appearance of 1a / 1b Northcote Avenue. However, taken together with the equally ramshackle front elevation of area 'Y', the effect is not only harmful in terms of its scale and form, but also in proportions and space around the building. Thus, the additional height of area 'Y', clearly added to incrementally over time, adds further unnecessary bulk and massing to the side and rear of the building. Its crude construction, clearly visible externally and reinforced when viewed internally, whilst matching that of area 'X' is unacceptably poor and mis-matched in the context of the painted, pebble-dashed frontage and flank of the main building. Furthermore, the additional extent of white upvc cladding to the upper elevation of area 'Y' is a dominant feature, notwithstanding its location towards the rear of the courtyard.
19. Whilst significantly less visible from public vantage points from the rear, the extended appeal property is nevertheless of a scale and form that appears incongruously large within the context of more modest single storey or paired pitched roof two-storey outriggers. As with the view from Northcote Avenue itself, the backdrop of the larger commercial buildings provides a degree of context in terms of scale for the appeal property, but this does not diminish or justify the building's form, as added to by areas 'X' and 'Y'.
20. Although the appellant cites a Council 'officer report' in relation to a previous application for planning permission⁵ which suggests the site is 'suitable for development with readjustments to the planning design', it seems clear to me

⁴ Drwg no: 03 as per Document GK3

⁵ LPA Ref No: 221051FUL – appellant's 'Grounds of Appeal' (dated 1 November 2022) at paragraph 4.1.1

that the scheme enforced against does not demonstrate suitable 'readjustments'. Rather, it is for the reasons I have set out, incongruous and jarring in terms of its scale, proportions, appearance and space around the building. Furthermore, the mix of materials and crude methods of construction and finishing draw the eye, despite the position within the site of the extensions, and add to the clear and material harm to the character and appearance of the host building and to the surrounding area that has arisen.

21. The appeal scheme is contrary to London Plan (LP) Policy D3 and Ealing Development Management Plan (EDMP) Policies 7.4 and 7B which, together and amongst other things, seek to secure high quality development that optimises site capacity but in an appropriate form and manner that complements existing building patterns, scale, materials and detailing and by ensuring high quality architecture and the coherent development of the site. The appeal scheme fails in these respects.

Living conditions

22. I saw from my visit to the site that as a consequence of the alterations and extensions referred to as area 'X' there is now a significantly extended two storey flank elevation directly adjacent to the rear, and now heavily enclosed rear yard, of the neighbouring property. This, in turn, ties in to the pre-existing 'office' element of the attached outbuildings which, whilst not a full two storeys in height is nevertheless higher than a typical single storey building.
23. The consequences of the extension of the property by virtue of the creation of area 'X' has been to significantly extend the depth of the building's two storey flank elevation beyond the rear elevation of the neighbouring property. That neighbouring property benefits from only a small single storey rear build-out and so, as a result, is harmfully enclosed, outlook curtailed and sunlight and daylight restricted by the extended appeal property. This is to the detriment of occupants' living conditions.
24. The scale of the extended property is further compounded by the presence of a number of windows within the flank elevation facing towards 1 Northcote Avenue. These windows, and indeed a door, look (and open) directly towards the rear yard area of the neighbouring property and afford direct, elevated and uninterrupted views of the yard and back towards the rear windows on that property. There is inevitably and undoubtedly a significant and harmful degree of overlooking and intervisibility as a consequence, to the further detriment of the living conditions of occupiers of the neighbouring property. Obscure glazing may mitigate some of that impact, but would not address instances of open doors or windows. Nor is it clear whether the appellants' intention is for obscure glazing to be fitted to some or all of the windows present. I am not therefore persuaded that this measure would render the scheme acceptable in this respect.
25. LP Policy D3 and EDMP Policies 7.4 and 7B set out the Council's approach to securing high quality development. The provision of a high standard of amenity and living conditions for adjacent users and uses is a central element of the Council's goal of high quality development. For the reasons I have set out, the appeal scheme fails to make such provision.
26. The third reason for issuing the notice includes reference to EDMP Policy 7D which appears to set out the Council's approach to the provision of open space.

The lack of a contribution towards, or provision of, open space is not cited as a reason for issuing the notice, nor indeed does the notice make reference to the nature of the development that the extended building would facilitate. As such, I conclude that EDMP Policy 7D is not determinative in my consideration of this matter.

Conclusion on the appeal on ground (a)

27. For the reasons given above, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal on ground (a) should fail.

Appeals A and B

The appeals on ground (f)

28. An appeal under ground (f) may be brought if it is felt that the steps required by the notice to be taken exceed what is necessary to remedy any breach of planning control which may be constituted by those matters or, as the case may be, to remedy any injury to amenity which has been caused by any such breach. Section 173 of the Act indicates that there are two purposes which the requirements of an enforcement notice can seek to achieve. The first purpose (s173(4)(a)) is to remedy the breach of planning control which has occurred; the second (s173(4)(b)) is to remedy any injury to amenity which has been caused by the breach.
29. The area 'X' as shown on the notice's plan and the appellants' plan 'GK3' is accurately described as an infill extension. What were previously the external elevations of the rear of the main property and the upper portion of the taller rear outbuilding's elevation have essentially become area 'X's' internal walls. The two flank walls are a mix of masonry, blockwork and upvc-clad timber stud-work framing, with the construction of a flat roof over to enclose the space as shown on the GK3 plan.
30. The appellants' ground (f) case is made on the basis that the notice's requirement to remove the area 'X' infill extension exceeds what is necessary to remedy the breach of planning control. However, the breach is clearly stated on the notice and the requirements are consistent with remedying that breach of planning control.
31. Nevertheless, it is argued that the requirements exceed what is necessary to remedy the breach as alternative schemes set out in what the appellants refer to as the 'second application'⁶ and the 'third application' would permit walls to remain in situ. However, I have no further information regarding a 'third application', whilst I consider the 'second application' scheme as Appeal C, below. For reasons I have set out in the procedural matters, above, I am not persuaded that the appellants have demonstrated sufficiently an alternative scheme for the purposes of s177(1) as being part of the matters enforced against.
32. Thus, in this case, the notice requires the removal of area 'X' in its entirety, and the lowering of the roof over area 'Y' to that of its previous level. These steps are consistent with the purpose of remedying the breach of planning control in accordance with s173(4)(a), the breach being as described in the notice. The notice's requirements are therefore entirely consistent with the

⁶ LPA Ref No: 221051FUL

breach of planning control it seeks to remedy, and do not exceed what is necessary to remedy the breach of planning control. I am satisfied that the appellants are best-placed to be able to determine the extent of the levels prior to the alleged works being carried and so the requirements of the notice are sufficiently clear and precise. The appeals on ground (f) must therefore fail.

The appeals on ground (g)

33. The appeals on ground (g) are made to seek an extended period of time for compliance with the notice's requirements and to allow the Council's consideration of subsequent applications. One of those applications is the subject of Appeal C (the 'second application') whilst the other (the 'third' application') had not been submitted at the time of the Council's statement. I have not been advised further regarding the status or progress of the 'third' application.
34. The appellants did not, initially at least, state what period of time they were seeking for compliance with the notice's requirements. However, it was subsequently confirmed that a period of 6 months would be sought under the ground (g) appeals. Whilst the first of the stated reasons⁷ is no longer directly relevant as this matter is dealt with by way of Appeal C, and the second of the stated reasons is unclear and unsubstantiated, I am inclined to accept the difficulties otherwise likely to be experienced in terms of ensuring sufficient time for obtaining quotes from trades and to put in place sufficient funds.
35. I am aware that current supply-chain pressures within the construction industries are capable of causing difficulties in these respects, and the period initially set out within the notice strikes me as being somewhat 'tight'. I agree therefore that the period for compliance with the notice's requirements should be 6, rather than 3, months and I shall vary the notice accordingly. The appeals on ground (g) succeed for the reasons given.

Appeals A and B Conclusion

36. For the reasons given above, I conclude that Appeals A and B should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice with a variation and refuse to grant planning permission on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

Appeal C

37. The main issues are the effects of the appeal scheme upon:

- The character and appearance of the appeal property and site, and the surrounding area;
- The living conditions of existing occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular regard to outlook, daylight and sunlight and privacy; and
- The living conditions of future occupiers of the appeal scheme, with particular regard to the quantity and quality of the accommodation that would be provided.

⁷ As per e-mail dated 22 August 2022

Character and appearance

38. The Appeal C scheme seeks to create two additional residential flats at first floor level and, as part of that proposal, would also physically alter the external appearance and form of what presently exists. Within what was referred to in appeals A and B as area 'X', this scheme seeks to break up the bulk and massing of the upper floor flank elevations with the removal on each side of a short length of the flank wall. Inserted into these areas would instead be railing screens to an open-sided outdoor terrace, one facing north towards 1 Northcote Avenue and one facing south, over the access and service court to the south.
39. Whilst these changes to the current structure would break up the scale, massing and proportions of the rearward additions to the building, it would not do so entirely. The scheme would retain a large proportion of the current first floor area 'X' area, as well as a still significant length of first floor flank wall. Whilst this length of wall would be located towards the rear of the plot, it would nevertheless remain as a significant factor in establishing an overwhelming and dominant scale of extension at the rear of the property and of neighbouring properties. In any event, the break in the presently continuous first floor flank elevation would be limited and would do little to hide the still-substantial rearward spread of the building, or the additional scale and extent of the first-floor portion of the building. Cumulatively, the appeal scheme would further underline the piecemeal nature of development within a small and constrained site and add to the cramped and intensive nature of development within the site.
40. The extension would retain the current first floor projection beyond the side of the main building's gable elevation and would retain the additional height and bulk of the raised roof line and taller elevation of area 'Y'. From Northcote Avenue the 'break' created to facilitate the terrace would be barely visible and would do little to disguise the bulk and rearward depth of the extended building. From the rear, the additional height of the altered area 'X' and the consolidating work to increase the height of the roof above area 'Y' would result in a scale of development towards the rear of the site at odds with the prevailing form of development along the rears of Northcote Avenue and Alexandra Avenue.
41. Whilst I accept, as explained above in relation to Appeal A's ground (a) appeal, that the adjacent commercial buildings provide a degree of context to the upper floor alterations at the appeal property, such substantial built elements as proposed in this instance are nevertheless uncommon amongst the rear lane setting of properties on Northcote Avenue and the opposing Alexandra Avenue. Moreover, the cumulative effect of the first-floor extensions (area 'X') and the raising of the roof (area 'Y') is to result in a significantly more substantial building that bridges the gap in context and scale between the appeal property and the commercial buildings on The Broadway / Uxbridge Road that back on to the appeal site.
42. For these reasons, I conclude that the appeal scheme would significantly extend the appeal property in a manner and scale that is at odds with the prevailing scale, pattern of development and character of the surrounding Northcote Avenue and Alexandra Avenue area. Whilst also set back from the Northcote Avenue street frontage, the cumulative scale of the extended

property, together with those elements previously added, would result in an incongruous form of development that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

43. The appeal scheme is therefore contrary to LP Policy D4 and EDMP Policies 7.4 and 7B. Together these policies seek, amongst other things, to secure high quality development and deliver good design that optimises site capacity. This should be done in an appropriate form and manner that complements existing building patterns, scale, materials and detailing and by ensuring high quality architecture and the coherent development of the site. For the reasons I have set out, the appeal scheme fails in these respects and is therefore contrary to LP Policy D4 and EDMP Policies 7.4 and 7B.

Living conditions – existing occupiers

44. The rear elevations of properties along Northcote Avenue typically have single storey rear build-outs. The appeal property already has a two storey, full width build-out to the rear, added to which various single storey outbuildings sprawl towards the rear of the plot. The appeals A and B deal with the additional first floor extension that has been added in the form of area 'X'.
45. The appeal scheme before me in Appeal C seeks to formalise parts of these previous works to create an additional two flats at first floor level, partly within the area 'X'. The scheme would utilise the first-floor flank wall already constructed, albeit within the insertion of a break in the elevation to allow the creation of a terrace for one of the flats.
46. Nevertheless, a substantial proportion of the first-floor wall would remain, directly adjacent to the neighbouring property at 1 Northcote Avenue and its rear yard. The cumulative effect of the existing build-out and the retained element of first floor flank wall would continue to result in an overwhelming, overpowering and harmfully enclosing structure at the rear of the appeal property. Furthermore, the height of this structure, and its position due south of the neighbouring property, would result in significant overshadowing of the rear of No. 1 and its yard. The short break in the elevation would do little to alleviate these issues, whilst at the same time adding to the sense of overlooking and loss of privacy that would arise from the two windows serving the open plan living space of flat '1L' that would also look directly out over that neighbouring property.
47. Taking these factors together, the proposal would have a significant and harmful effect upon the living conditions of occupiers of the neighbouring property at 1 Northcote Avenue. This would be detrimental to the living conditions and amenities enjoyed by residents of that property and would be contrary to LP Policy D4 and EDMP Policies 7.4 and 7B. Together, these policies seek to secure high quality design and high standards of living conditions and amenities. For the reasons set out, the appeal scheme fails to do so.
48. EDMP Policy 7D is also cited in relation to the effect of the proposed development on the residential amenity and living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties. However, this policy appears to set out the Council's approach to the provision of open space, a matter to which the stated refusal reasons do not refer. Thus, the lack of a contribution towards, or provision of, open space is not cited as a reason for refuse and as such, I conclude that EDMP Policy 7D is not determinative in my consideration of this matter.

Living conditions – future occupiers

49. The two additional units proposed, together with the enlargement of flat '1D', would satisfy the minimum space standards for single occupancy studios. There would also be outdoor space in the form of terraces of varying sizes for the three first floor flats, together with an additional bi-fold door opening for flat '1D' to supplement its terrace area.
50. However, the two larger terrace areas would either open out directly over and afford views across, the neighbouring property at 1 Northcote Avenue, or into the access and service yard at the side of the appeal property. These areas would be heavily overlooked and, as they create potential overlooking of neighbouring properties so they would also be subject to overlooking and harmful effects on the privacy and living conditions of future occupiers of the proposed flats.
51. Moreover, and perhaps symptomatic of the somewhat haphazard development of the site evidenced by the site's planning history and chronology, the layout of the first-floor flats would not be well matched to the layout of the ground floor flat units. Thus, the plans show main living areas for the first-floor flats above bedroom areas, and vice versa. Whilst I have not been directed towards any specific development plan policy requirement or any supplementary planning documentation seeking appropriate stacking of developments, EDMP Policy 7B is clear that a high standard of amenity for users and adjacent uses is essential to all development⁸. Amongst the factors that it states will inform high standards of amenity, schemes should provide coherent development of the site and appropriate levels of development within the site. The layout of the proposed first floor flats relative to those below is such that the appellant has not demonstrated that the proposal would deliver high standards of amenity for occupiers in the manner sought by EDMP Policy 7B and which LP Policy D4 also seeks.

Other Matters

52. The refusal reasons do not directly refer to an absence of secure, covered and collective refuse or cycle storage at the appeal site. However, development plan policies relevant to such provisions⁹ are cited in relation to the refusal reason concerned with the general quality of living conditions for future and existing residents, and the Council consider these matters in their officer report for the appeal scheme. As I have concluded in relation to the main issues that the appeal C scheme should be dismissed, I have not considered these matters further.
53. The appellant has drawn my attention to the appeal site's town location. I have not been made aware whether or not this is a formal development plan designation, but I did note the site's location relative to The Broadway / Uxbridge Road and the services and facilities thereon. Nor has the appellant directed me towards the outdoor spaces which are suggested to be within walking distance. Nevertheless, the appeal C scheme would deliver additional housing that would appeal to a distinct market given its limited size. I have not means of ensuring that the resulting flats would be truly affordable and, even if

⁸ Paragraph E7.B.1 – supporting text to EDMP Policy 7B

⁹ EDMP Policies SI8 and T5

they were, neither that nor the small boost to housing supply persuades me as to the acceptability of the appeal C scheme.

54. The presence of other flats and HMOs in neighbouring sites does not diminish the harm that I have identified. Nor does the absence of objection to the proposal from occupiers of neighbouring properties or letters of support from current tenants of flats elsewhere within the wider appeal property¹⁰. The installation of gates has been credited by the appellants as deterring the use of the yard for anti-social purposes. However, as it has not been demonstrated that these were part of the appeal C scheme, or the matters enforced against, this matter does not weigh in support of the appeal scheme. These matters are not therefore sufficient to persuade me as to the acceptability of the appeal C scheme.

Conclusion on Appeal C

55. For the reasons set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Robbie

INSPECTOR

¹⁰ Flats 1A, 1D and 1H