



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2019

**by L Perkins BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/3224416**  
**545 High Road, Wembley HA0 2DJ**

- 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 S Adhinamilaghi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
  - The application Ref 18/2329, dated 15 June 2018, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2018.
  - The development proposed is demolition of existing rear extension, proposed rear extension, new shop front and internal alterations.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. At the site visit it was apparent that development has commenced on the appeal site as a new extension has been constructed at the rear. However, what I saw does not reflect the development applied for in this case so I have based my decision on the drawings provided with this appeal.

### Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
  - the character and appearance of the area, and
  - highway safety and the efficient operation of the highway network in the vicinity of the appeal site.

### Reasons

#### *Character and Appearance*

4. The area is characterised by 3 storey pitched roof terraced buildings over basements. Various commercial units occupy the ground floor and basement levels and residential accommodation occupies the upper floors. At the rear of the terrace is a narrow service road at basement level which runs from Ranelagh Road.
5. Most buildings in the terrace have been extended at the rear. At basement level space generally exists between the service road and the rear elevation of the terrace of buildings, providing an area for external bin storage and the loading/unloading of vehicles without obstructing the service road. Some

buildings in the terrace have a cantilevered ground floor rear extension built over this external space but generally ground floor extensions do not extend over the service road.

6. At basement level the proposed extension would be built up to the closest edge of the service road and at ground floor level it would be cantilevered over the service road leaving a void for the passage of vehicles beneath. Consequently the proposed extension would stand proud of the rear ground floor elevations of the buildings either side. The combination of this depth and the siting of the extension would make it appear as an incongruous and bulky addition to the building which would be clearly seen from Ranelagh Road.
7. Whilst at my site visit I saw an extension in the terrace which is constructed over the service road I have no details of how this came to exist and so I give this limited weight in my decision. I conclude the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would not comply with Policy DMP1 of the Council's Development Management Policies 2016. This policy seeks that development is of a location, siting, scale and design that complements the locality.

#### *Highway Safety*

8. The basement level part of the proposed extension would leave no external space within the appeal site for the loading or unloading of vehicles. Consequently, loading and unloading for the appeal site would need to be carried out on the service road itself. This would block access to the rear of other commercial units in the terrace which are further from Ranelagh Road.
9. This would increase the demand for and likelihood of loading and unloading from High Road or Ranelagh Road. As I saw on my site visit, Ranelagh Road is narrow and heavily parked and High Road is a busy, narrow road which carries several bus routes. As such, the servicing of commercial units within this terrace from High Road or Ranelagh Road would be likely to lead to highway obstructions as there is insufficient width for servicing in addition to the use of these roads by existing vehicles and pedestrians.
10. I appreciate there is another extension further along in the terrace which oversails the service road but the existence of this is not a good enough reason for another extension which would result in servicing for more properties in this terrace being restricted.
11. I conclude on this main issue the proposal would harm highway safety and the efficient operation of the highway network in the vicinity of the appeal site. This would not comply with Policy DMP13 of the Development Management Policies 2016. This policy seeks servicing facilities in developments are provided off the highway wherever possible.

#### **Other Matters**

12. My attention has been drawn to a previous application, ref: 17/4699. However, no further details have been provided and so I do not know the relevance of this application to the appeal scheme and as such I give it limited weight in my decision.

**Conclusion**

13. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

*L Perkins*

INSPECTOR