



**Please reply to:**

34 Wellington Road  
Northfields  
Ealing  
W5 4UH

James Hutchinson  
Planning Services  
Ealing Council  
Perceval House  
14-16 Uxbridge Road  
Ealing  
W5 2HL

3<sup>RD</sup> June 2013

Dear Mr Hutchinson,

**Planning Application P/2013/1087**  
**Assyrian House, South Ealing Road / Temple Road, Ealing, W5 4SL**

I write on behalf of our residents' association in respect of the above planning application.

**1 Introduction:**

Ealing Fields Residents' Association (EFRA) is a large residents' association with in excess of 500 subscription members who live in the neighbourhood surrounding Northfields station.

This locally prominent application site lies at the edge of our membership area and the nature and scale of the proposed development has implications for the amenity of our members and their neighbours.

**2 Summary**

We object to the granting of the planning application for the following reasons:

- The failure of the proposed development to respect the externally visible frontages of this prominent local heritage building,
- The impact of the proposed two storey western infill along the site's boundary with 2 Temple Road,

- Parking and Traffic pressures on the occupiers of the neighbouring residential side streets,
- Noise from evening and weekend use of the new facilities and their clientele,
- Failure of the applicant to submit a Transport Assessment, or equivalent information, to support the doubling in size of these facilities and their hiring out for functions and similar activities,
- The absence of “existing drawings”, i.e. plans, elevations and sections, which means that it is possible to under identify the scale of the proposed alterations.

The above concerns are set out in greater detail below.

### **3 Exterior Street Frontages**

The late Victorian Hall, now used as the Assyrian Centre, on the junction of Temple and South Ealing Roads, dates from the urbanisation of the local area and represents one of the few heritage buildings in the locality. We therefore believe that its exterior street frontages should be retained intact and should not be the subject of unsympathetic external alterations.

We therefore object to the proposed large dormer window along the Temple Road Frontage and the removal of the existing north facing apex at the centre point of this frontage. We note that dormer windows on a front roof slope are regarded as unacceptable according to the second paragraph on page 18 of the Council’s SPD 4.

The fenestration of the proposed ground floor windows on the Temple Road frontage is disappointing and reminiscent of the grills installed in front of window openings on high security buildings.

We are disappointed by the exterior design and fenestration proposed for the infill to the south of the existing hall on the South Ealing Road frontage. This lacks the sympathy for the existing building and finesse shown by extensions to other local community/religious buildings, for example the hall at Christ the Saviour, and its neighbouring junior school, in Ealing town centre, St Andrew’s church hall in Mount Park Road, and St Paul’s church hall in Brentford.

We also draw your attention to the provisions of Table 5 G of the UDP.

We comment on the exterior frontage of the proposed infill between the Assyrian Centre and 2 Temple Road below.

### **4 Infill between Assyrian Centre and 2 Temple Road**

While a ground floor infill at this location could be designed to blend into the Temple Road street scene, the construction of a first floor above it would be unacceptable.

The elevations show the proposed first floor infill as extending materially above the height of the eaves of the neighbouring 2 Temple Road. They also show the front of the proposed first floor projecting forward of the roof slope of the Victorian hall. The bulk and massing of the proposed extension would be excessive and therefore unacceptable. Its prominence and massing would be exacerbated by the exterior design chosen by the applicant.

We again draw your attention to the provisions of Table 5 G of the UDP.

## **5 Rear First Floor Terrace**

The first floor plan shows a terrace at the southwest corner of the proposed development. The terrace would be connected to the proposed restaurant and clubroom by double doors. These are also shown on the elevation drawing.

Presumably the terrace is intended to provide a smoking venue for users of the proposed first floor restaurant and club room. This would result in an exceptional loss of amenity for the residents of the neighbouring 2 Temple Road.

We note that it is against council policy to permit the construction of roof terraces where they would overlook neighbouring residential properties and result in unacceptable overlooking. This is set out in SPD 4 on pages 15 and 20, and Table 5 C 3 of the UDP.

## **6 Facilities for Young People**

Despite this proposal representing a doubling of the floorspace of this community centre, we cannot locate any facilities for children or young people.

This omission would appear to reduce the “family friendly” nature of this development and would suggest that the expanded facilities are intended to attract adults, many of whom can be expected to travel by car.

We draw your attention to the provisions in Table 8 D of the UDP.

## **7 Parking Pressures in the Surrounding Residential Side Streets**

The proposals would result in the deletion of the small amount of on-site parking remaining on the site.

In the Design and Access Statement the applicant states that:

- The proposal is to double the floorspace of the existing building – PDF page 8
- The existing ground floor hall can accommodate 150-200 persons – PDF page 9
- That only 30-40 members use the existing ground floor hall – PDF page 9
- That existing facilities will be transferred to the proposed first floor facilities – PDF page 9
- That the proposed ground floor hall will be used for “banquet and other large functions”. – PDF page 9
- That the proposed ground floor facilities will be rented out in order to generate income – PDF pages 2, 6 and 9

The applicant acknowledges that the current facilities are poorly patronised by members of the Assyrian community, a pattern of attendance which is common to many diaspora communities as they progress through the generations and descendants move away.

The statements in the Design and Access Statement indicate that the applicants are basing the expansion of their facilities on the assumption that they will be able to attract a very large number of income generating visitors and users from outside the Assyrian community to the expanded facilities.

The configuration of the expanded facilities and their stated use for high profile events, such as weddings and seasonal festivities, suggests that the majority of attendees will seek to travel by motor cars. It is most unusual for attendees of high profile and formal events to travel to and from them on public transport, even if public transport provided a direct route.

There is no quantification of the number of visitors and car movements which the proposed facilities are expected to attract. We find the absence of this information concerning, as the applicant must have modelled future attendances as part of their assessment of the financial viability of the project.

We are left with the expectation that a large number of patrons, sometimes in excess of the 150-200 cited by the applicant, will arrive by car whenever there is an evening function in the ground floor hall. This will place unacceptable parking pressures on the surrounding residential side streets and result in a material loss of amenity to the surrounding residents.

As the local CPZ only operates up to 7.30 pm Monday to Friday and up to 1.00pm on Saturdays, there is nothing to protect the surrounding residents from evening parking on Mondays to Fridays, afternoon parking on Saturdays, and all day parking on Sunday's.

In these circumstances we believe that this application should be refused on parking grounds until such time as the applicant has submitted a detailed Transport Assessment for public consultation and scrutiny.

### **8 Servicing Proposed Facilities**

There is no indication as to how the proposed facilities will be serviced.

This information should be provided, and preferably as a section of the missing Transport Assessment.

### **9 Noise**

We cannot locate any information as to how the building will be "sound proofed" to ensure that noise from functions etc cannot be heard in the neighbouring residential properties.

Nor can we locate any measures whereby the applicant will seek to control the noise which will result from patrons leaving the premises late at night and in the early hours of the morning to collecting their parked cars from the surrounding residential side streets.

The proximity of three primary schools, Little Ealing, Mount Carmel and Grange, means that a disproportionate proportion of the neighbouring homes are occupied by families with young children. Late night noise in these residential side streets is therefore a particular concern in the case of this application.

We understand that the London Plan places considerable emphasis on protecting residential neighbourhoods from any increase in noise.

## **10 Missing Drawings**

We are disappointed by the absence of any “existing” drawings.

This omission makes it difficult to fully comprehend the incremental nature of the proposed redevelopment and its impact on the community.

## **11 Failure to Consult Neighbouring Residents**

Given the scale of the proposed development, including the doubling of the existing floor space, we are disappointed by the applicant’s apparent failure to conduct pre-application consultations with all the residents of the neighbouring side streets. Approaching the occupants of a small number of neighbouring properties is no substitute for comprehensive community consultation.

We ask you to note this failure to consult adequately when drafting your report on the application.

## **12 Conclusion**

For the reasons set out above, and in the interests of the human rights of the neighbouring residents, we request that this application is unconditionally refused.

Yours Sincerely

James Guest

Ealing Fields Residents’ Association  
Committee Member with responsibility for Planning Matters