
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2017

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/16/3162033

5 Queenscourt, Wembley, HA9 7QX

- 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 Usman Malik against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 16/1792 was refused by notice dated 16 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form submitted with the appeal, dated 26 October 2015, as double storey side extension with single storey conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The decision notice and appeal form describe the development as 'Demolition of side garage and erection of a two storey side and rear extension with associated alterations to the roof of the existing front porch to dwellinghouse'. It is clear that the Council's decision was based on plans that are before me,¹ which do not include a conservatory. I understand the conservatory formed part of an earlier proposal. Accordingly I have dealt with the appeal on the basis of the drawings before me, as considered by the Council.
3. During the course of the appeal the Council confirmed that it's Unitary Development Plan, referred to in the decision notice, had been superseded by the Brent Local Plan: Development Management Policies 2016. The appellant has been given the opportunity to comment on the policy changes. It seems to me that the substance of the relevant policy referred to is not materially different to those originally cited. Nevertheless I have determined the application against the most up to date policy.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons

5. 5 Queenscourt is a semi-detached dwelling which has been substantially altered. Its hipped roof has been replaced with a side gable and a large flat

¹ Drawing No 1148A rev 4 dated February 2016 and proposed roof plan

roofed dormer has been constructed across the rear roof slope. In addition, plans indicate that there is a flat roofed single storey extension at the rear. The site is located in a well-established residential area and I noted that many of the dwellings in the street have been substantially altered such that there is no longer a uniformity to the appearance of the area.

6. The proposal seeks the demolition of the existing flat roof garage to the side of the property and its replacement with a two-storey extension with a hipped roof and a parapet wall to the side. The first floor of the extension would be set back from the front elevation of the dwelling and the ground floor would align with it. At the rear, the extension would project beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling. A minor alteration is proposed to the roof of the existing front porch, to which the Council raise no objection. I have no reason to disagree.
7. The Council's 'Altering and Extending Your Home' Supplementary Planning Guidance No 5 2002 (SPG) provides advice for householders in terms of the design of proposed extensions. It is made clear in the SPG that permission will not be granted for a side extension to a house that has a conversion from a hipped roof to a full end gable. Such a conversion has already occurred at the appeal property.
8. The roof of the proposed extension would be hipped, in contrast to that of the main part of the building and would be set down from the ridgeline. Accordingly, it would not respect the form and appearance of the existing dwelling and would have an awkward, discordant appearance. Moreover, the proposal would add to the number of disparate extensions on the property and result in a building that lacked visual coherence.
9. I accept that many properties on Queenscourt have been altered or extended. However, the detailed design of the proposal, in addition to the extensions that have already occurred, would harm the character and appearance of the host property and therefore the surrounding area. I acknowledge that some changes to the proposal have been made since the previous application, refused on appeal² including the realignment of the extension at ground floor level. However, the extension now proposed would project back from the rear wall of the existing dwelling and would be a bulky addition. As a result of its detailed design, as set out above, the extension would relate poorly to the host dwelling.
10. Consequently for these reasons, the proposal would fail to comply with Policy DMP 1 of the Council's Development Management Policies, which seeks amongst other things, to ensure that development has a high level of internal and external amenity and compliments the locality.
11. Therefore, taking into account all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR

² Appeal ref: APP/T5150/D/15/3141381