
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2017

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24th October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/17/3179131
2 Grosvenor Crescent, London NW9 9DA

- 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 M. Nagdi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 17/1514, dated 11 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is the removal of a garage, the erection of a 2 storey side extension and single storey front and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey end of terrace house, which is located close to the junction of Grosvenor Crescent and Brompton Road. The site contains a wide frontage from which the side boundary with 44 Brompton Road quickly narrows back towards the house and the rear garden beyond. A flat roofed single storey garage is currently located between the house and this boundary. The area more broadly comprises of reasonably uniform short rows of terraced properties with simple roof forms. Plots are generally of narrow width, apart from corner plots which broaden towards their site frontage, as with the appeal site.
4. The proposed two storey extension would noticeably alter the appearance of the house because it would incorporate a complicated roof form, due to its proposed arrangement within the narrowing confines of the side boundary. This would result in a discordant appearance to the house, as the form of the proposed roof would be in marked contrast to the simpler form of the existing roof.
5. The two storey extension would be prominent in the streetscene due to its location close to the junction, the wide frontage of the plot and the splayed arrangement of the side boundary. This would only add to the incongruity of the proposed roof as it would pronounce that it would not sit comfortably in the

streetscene, with its contrast to the simpler roof forms on the other houses in its vicinity.

6. With the two storey extension projecting back beyond the rear elevation of the existing house, the roof would be of some bulk and, similarly, this would be apparent from the streetscene with views afforded over the garage of No 44. This would serve to increase the overall awkward nature of the design.
7. For the reasons I have set out, I consider the roof would not appear integrated with the design of the existing roof, but would depart from the existing simpler roof form. I also acknowledge that the proposal was revised to attempt to address the Council's concerns expressed during the planning application and the Council's '1:2 rule', that the width has sought to comply with that of the existing living room and that it would follow the line of the boundary. These matters do not, though, address the concerns I have expressed over the proposed design of the roof.
8. I conclude the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance on the building and the area. As such, it would not comply with Policy CP17 of the Council of the London Borough of Brent Core Strategy (2010) which seeks to protect the distinctive suburban character of Brent from inappropriate development. It would also not comply with Policy DMP1 of the Council's Development Management Policies (2016) which states development will be acceptable provided it is of a design which complements the locality.

Other Matters

9. With regard to the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 4 Grosvenor Crescent, I find the proposal would not unduly affect their outlook and daylight with the moderate height and projection of the proposed rear single storey extension, despite the proximity to the boundary and the rear of that property. Whilst the rear extension would result in a slight infringement of the guidelines that the Council operate, this is not decisive in this instance. However, this does not alter my conclusions with regard to character and appearance.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR