
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2017

by L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/17/3173969
29 West Hill, Brent, Wembley HA9 9RN

- 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 Ranjiv Sharma against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 17/0619, dated 8 November 2015, was refused by notice dated 5 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is erection of a side two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a side two storey extension at 29 West Hill, Brent, Wembley HA9 9RN in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 17/0619, dated 8 November 2015, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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: Site Location Plan 1:1250 and Existing and Proposed Plans Erection of two storey extension Drawing No A1/141 Revision 1.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling in a residential area characterised by semi-detached properties all set a similar distance back from the road. Many of the dwellings have been extended, they incorporate both hipped roofs and gables and are finished in a variety of materials including brick and render. Thus the area has a formal but varied character and appearance.

4. Even though the proposed extension would incorporate a hipped roof which would adjoin a gable, this type of relationship is a common feature of the street scene. Furthermore, the proposed extension would be set back from the main front elevation of the appeal dwelling and its ridge would be set down from the ridge of the main roof. Moreover, the adjoining semi-detached property has also been extending to the side. Thus the proposed extension would not unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties, appear overly prominent or out of place in a residential area which has a varied character and appearance.
5. For these reasons the proposed extension would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with the development plan, specifically Policy DMP1 of the London Borough of Brent Local Plan Development Management Policies (2016) which seeks to achieve good design. For the same reasons it would also accord with Supplementary Planning Guidance 5 – Altering and Extending Your Home (2002).

Conditions

6. The conditions imposed are those which have been suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition which requires materials to match the existing dwelling in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the proposed development would accord with the development plan and thus the appeal should be allowed.

L Fleming

INSPECTOR