

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27th March 2017

by Alison Roland BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11th April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/17/3168035
26 Helena Road, London, NW10 1JA.

- 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 P Marsh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref: 16/4325 dated 4 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor rear extension, at 26 Helena Road, London, NW10 1JA, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 16/4325 dated 4 October 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No: 26HL/P01: Existing/Proposed Plans/Elev; Drawing No: 26HL/P02: Existing/Proposed Side Elev.
 - 3) Specifications or samples of materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extension hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to their use in the development. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved materials.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the implications of the proposal for the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a semi-detached dwelling which has been subject to a single storey flat roofed rear extension and large box dormer in the rear roof slope. The appeal proposal would see the introduction of a first floor extension above part of the aforementioned single storey extension. It would
-

have a rearwards projection of around 1.5 metres and the apex of the roof would intersect with the dormer.

4. The Council take exception to the intersection of the roof with the existing dormer, but I consider it would have an unremarkable appearance and indeed, it would be not dissimilar to an extension which has been carried out to No 22 Helena Road, the next door but one property. Moreover, with a very limited depth and occupying around half the width of the host dwelling, the proposal would amount to a modest addition, which would appear very much subservient thereto. Whilst the Council cite a resultant unbalanced roof to the host property, I consider the proposal would appear as a harmonious addition to the rear elevation, would help provide articulation to it and break up the strong horizontal emphasis imparted by the existing rear dormer and single storey extension.
5. Even taken in conjunction with the previous extensions to the property, I cannot accept that the resultant dwelling would appear over developed. This is all the more the case, given the scale of the original semis in the immediate vicinity, which is considerably larger than most dwellings of this type.
6. For these reasons, I conclude on the main issue that the proposal would integrate comfortably with the host dwelling and wider character and appearance of the area. I thus find no conflict with Policy DMP1 of the London Borough of Brent Local Plan Development Management Policies (2016), Policy CP 17 of the London Borough of Brent Core Strategy (2010), the guidance in Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 5: *Altering and Extending Your Home* (2002), or the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework. These seek to secure high quality development which complements the locality and protects the distinctive suburban character of Brent from inappropriate development.

Other Matters

7. The occupiers of No 79 Kendal Road have expressed concern about loss of privacy from the proposed first floor window. However, given the significant separation distance between the proposal and that particular property and its garden, I do not consider it would give rise to any appreciable increase in overlooking.
8. The occupiers of No 28 Helena Road express concern about loss of light. Given the limited rearwards projection of the proposal and its siting away from the boundary with that property, I cannot concur that there would be any appreciable impact in this regard.
9. The occupier of No 24 Helena Road has concerns about loss of light, outlook and overbearing effects. However given the limited depth of the extension, I do not consider it would have a material impact in these regards. Whilst the proposal would be clearly visible from the garden of that property, it would be seen against the backdrop and much larger massing of the host dwelling and as such, it would not appear overly assertive relative thereto. As the main outlook from the first floor window would be down the appellant's garden, I also do not accept that it would give rise to any appreciable overlooking of that property or its garden.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time limit for commencement of development and confining the approval to specified plans, the Council suggest a matching materials condition. A condition confining the approval to specified plans is necessary for clarity. A matching materials condition could create ambiguity as the property currently appears unfinished and consequently there is a mix of external finishes. I shall instead require samples of materials to be submitted and agreed with the Council for the avoidance of doubt and in order to secure a satisfactory finish.

ALISON ROLAND

INSPECTOR