



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2017

by Helen Cassini BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 06 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/17/3180545 73 Norval Road, Wembley HA0 3TA

- 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 Mick Sheehan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref: 17/0996, dated 4 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a part single, part two storey side and rear extensions, conversion of garage into habitable accommodation, conversion of roof space into habitable accommodation with side roof lights and rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single, part two storey side and rear extensions, conversion of garage into habitable accommodation, conversion of roof space into habitable accommodation with side roof lights and rear dormer at 73 Norval Road, Wembley HA0 3TA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 17/0996, dated 4 March 2017, 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: Existing Plans and OS Map Drawing No: RPR-01; Existing Elevations Map Drawing No: RPR-02; Proposed Plans Drawing No: RPR-03 Rev A; Proposed Roof Plan and Sections Map Drawing No: RPR-04 Rev A and Proposed Elevations Map Drawing No: RPR-05 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing host building and thereafter retained.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant submitted revised plans¹ to the Council on 25 April 2017 in order to address issues which had been raised during the determination period. The appellant contends that the amended plans were not considered by the Council. Nevertheless, as these are the most up to date plans, the appeal has been determined based on these plans. As the Council has had the opportunity to

¹ Proposed Plans Drawing No: RPR-03 Rev A; Proposed Roof Plan and Sections Map Drawing No: RPR-04 Rev A and Proposed Elevations Map Drawing No: RPR-05 Rev A.

consider the amended plans, it is not considered either party has been prejudiced by this approach.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Sudbury Court Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached, 2-storey dwelling which has a white render exterior with elements of timber cladding and red brick. The dwelling backs onto Northwick Park, although a mature boundary line of vegetation separates the dwelling from the park. The surrounding area is predominately residential in nature, with a mix of detached and semidetached dwellings. From both the submitted evidence, and observations made during the site visit, a number of dwellings in proximity to the appeal site have been the subject of side and rear extensions.
5. The appeal site is located within the Sudbury Court Conservation Area (the Conservation Area). Amongst other things, the Sudbury Court Conservation Design Guide 2015 (the CADG) states that the special character of the area is due to the spacious positioning of houses set back from gently curved tree-lined roads.
6. Given the location within the Conservation Area, in accordance with section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, there is a duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. This is also reflected in the approach set out within the National Planning Policy Framework, which advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
7. In regard of the proposed conversion of the garage into a habitable room, the Council raised concern in relation to need to maintain the original design aspects of the garage. Following the proposed amendments the design includes timber doors and glass inserts. Accordingly, due to the original style of design, this aspect of the proposal is found to be an acceptable addition.
8. From observations made during the site visit, it was noted that the two neighbouring dwellings have constructed single storey rear extensions of a similar scale to that which is proposed. At approximately 3 metres in height, the proposed single storey extension fully complies with guidance contained within the CADG. It is however noted that the depth would exceed the guidance by approximately 0.5 metres. Nevertheless, given the presence of the existing extensions at the neighbouring dwellings and the minimal breach of the guidance, it is not considered that this aspect of the proposal would appear overly dominant or obtrusive.
9. Turning to the proposed first floor extension, the depth would comply with guidance contained within the CADG. In addition, adequate separation distances from the neighbouring boundaries and elevations would remain. It is however noted, that this aspect of the proposal would extend the whole width of the rear of this dwelling, contrary to guidance within the CADG.

10. Despite the technical breach of the CADG, the use of sympathetic materials and fenestration is proposed. Furthermore, the location of the first floor extension would not be visible from within the street scene. It is accepted that views of the extension would be visible from within Northwick Park. However, considerable separation distance exists between the rear of the appeal dwelling and the boundary of the park. Moreover, the boundary of the park and the dwelling is separated by mature vegetation. As such, views of the extension would be relatively well screened. Accordingly, it is not considered that the first floor rear extension would result in an oversized or overly prominent addition to the dwelling.
11. A rear dormer is proposed as part of the loft conversion. The location of the dormer is set down from the ridge line, up from the eaves and positioned in the centre line of the roof plane. The scale of the dormer has been significantly reduced and the use of sympathetic, matching materials is noted. Consequently, the dormer would represent a modest addition to the roof plane and due to the proposed location on the rear of the dwelling, would have minimal visual impact.
12. Roof lights situated within side elevations are not uncommon features on Norval Road and the wider locality. It is accepted that the roof lights would be visible from within the public realm. However, given the relatively low profile and the existing presence of such features, the visibility of the roof lights would preserve the existing character of the locality.
13. Despite evidence of crown roofs within the immediate locality, significant concern has been raised by the Council in regard of the proposed crown roof. The roof is required in order to join the hipped roofs over the proposed side and rear extensions at the same angle as the existing roof. However, from the submitted evidence the actual crown would represent a modest proportion of the roof, located at the top most section. In addition, the crown would also be concealed with ridge tiles.
14. Due to the positioning and design, the crown aspect of the proposed roof would not be visible from within the street scene or from the rear of the dwelling. As such, the crown roof aspect would be seen as a normal hipped roof extension, which is not an uncommon feature within an urban setting.
15. Turning my attention to the proposed side extension, this would be set back from the boundary by approximately 1 metre and from the front building line by some 2.5 metres. As such, this addition would remain subservient to the host dwelling.
16. These findings lead me to consider that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the area. Having given considerable importance and weight, and paid special attention, to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, it is therefore found that all aspects of the proposed development would preserve these attributes and hence the significance of the heritage asset.
17. As such the development would accord with the local character and heritage requirements of Policies DMP1 and DMP7 of the London Borough of Brent Local Plan Development Management Policies 2016 and guidance contained within the CADG.

Conditions

18. The conditions suggested by the Council have been considered against the tests of the Framework and advice provided by the Planning Practice Guidance. They are found to be reasonable and necessary in the circumstances of this case; however one has been edited for precision and clarity.
19. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans in order to provide certainty. A condition relating to materials is appropriate in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Conclusion

20. For the above reasons I therefore conclude that, subject to conditions, the appeal should be allowed.

Helen Cassini

INSPECTOR