
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 February 2020

by Mr JP Sargent BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/19/3236209

33 Park Chase, Wembley HA9 8EQ

- 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 Zeeshan Habib against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 19/2273, dated 26 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 July 2019.
 - The development is the erection of a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear extension at 33 Park Chase, Wembley HA9 8EQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/2273, dated 26 June 2019.

Procedural matters

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Zeeshan Habib against the Council, and that is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal concerns a property in a residential street that was originally a semi-detached dwelling but is currently in use as flats.
5. The extension before me has now been constructed, and serves the flat on the ground floor. It appears to be built mainly of UPVC, with solid infill panels and glazing to the sides and roof. UPVC is not an uncommon material to find on domestic properties as it is used in conservatories, windows, weatherboarding and so on, and indeed is apparent elsewhere in the vicinity. Consequently, although it has a different texture and finish to the walls of the main building, it is not of itself discordant in this context. Therefore, given the extension's limited size and taking account of its elevations being mainly solid rather than glazed, I consider it does not appear as an incongruous addition to the property, but rather is a subservient feature.
6. With regard to its impact on the wider area, views of the development are limited as the extension is at the back and the garden is enclosed by relatively

tall fencing. Whilst it can be seen from the rear garden and rooms of the adjoining property, only a small portion of the extension is apparent from there above the boundary fence, and again its appearance is comparable to that of a conservatory or similar. As such, when looking from that property I consider what is before me is not visually discordant.

7. Moreover, the extension is in the context of the adjacent dwellings, which, although maybe of similar designs originally, have been subject to a range of alterations and additions over time. The effect of this is to create a row of properties that, when looked at from the back, display a significant degree of variety and diversity. As a result, the row can accommodate a certain amount of change without harm. Therefore, from the few places from where it is noticeable, I am not satisfied that it appears as a poorly designed incongruous feature.
8. In coming to this view, I appreciate that the Council's *Supplementary Planning Document 2* (SPD2) says that, '*where possible*', materials should match the main house. However, in this instance I have found that harm does not arise from use of UPVC, and so that advice in SPD2, of itself, is not a basis to resist the appeal.
9. Accordingly, I conclude that the development does not detract unacceptably from the character and appearance of the area, and so in this regard it does not conflict with Policy DMP1 in the Council's *Development Management Policies*, which seeks development that is complementary to its locality, whilst any conflict with SPD2 does not warrant refusal in this instance.

Other matters

10. The limited projection and height of the structure, together with its siting to the north, mean it is not unduly dominant when seen from No 35, and it does not cause unacceptable harm to the outlook and daylight enjoyed at that property.
11. The Council has suggested 3 conditions. However, as the development appears to be completed there is no need for compliance with the approved plans or the condition requiring its commencement. Moreover, in my judgement its materials are satisfactory, and so the requirement they match those of the main building is unnecessary.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons given above I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

JP Sargent

INSPECTOR