
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2017

by Siobhan Watson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 12 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/16/3157961

33 & 35 Berkhamsted Avenue, Wembley, Brent, HA9 6DU

- 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 Kanti Raghwani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 16/1007, dated 8 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey porch extension at 33 & 35 Berkhamsted Avenue, Wembley, Brent, HA9 6DU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/1007, dated 8 March 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 33&35 Berkhamsted Ave/02 A; site location plan.
 - 3) The materials used in the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the Council refused planning permission the Council has adopted its Development Management Policies Document 2016 (DMP). The three UDP policies quoted in the Council's decision have, so far as relevant to this appeal, been replaced by DMP Policy DMP1: *General Development Management Policy*.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed porch extension upon the character and appearance of the building and street-scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is a pair of semi-detached houses and the porch would be attached to both dwellings of the pair. The design of the existing pair is not typical of other dwellings in the street, most notably because of the deep recess within which the front doors are located. However, the deep recess has no significant architectural merit and does not make any special contribution to
-

the character and appearance of the street-scene. The filling of this recess would therefore not look out of place within its context.

5. I appreciate that other dwellings have porches with a mono-pitch roof but the proposed hipped roof would be in keeping with the hipped main roof of the building. The apex of the porch roof would leave a clear gap under the bottom of the 1st floor windows and therefore, its height would not be excessive. Overall, I consider that the proposed porch would fit in well with the style of the parent building.
6. I therefore conclude that the proposed porch extension would have an acceptable effect upon the character and appearance of the building and street-scene. Consequently, I find no conflict with DMP Policy DMP1 which seeks to ensure that development provides high levels of external amenity and complements the locality. I also find no conflict with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 5 *Altering and Extending Your Home* which has similar objectives and indicates that porches must complement the design of the house.
7. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard implementation condition it is necessary in the interests of precision, to define the plans with which the scheme should accord. A condition concerning external materials is required in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
8. For the above reasons the appeal is allowed subject to conditions.

Siobhan Watson

INSPECTOR