



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020

by David Murray BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/20/3245168

107 Beverley Drive, Edgware, London, HA8 5NH.

- 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 Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 19/4060, dated 15 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of the garage into habitable room and first floor side extension together with front porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. I have used the description of the development as drafted by the Council rather than that on the application forms as it better describes all of the proposal as shown on the submitted plans.
3. The Council has raised various concerns about the accuracy of the submitted plans. These have been brought to the attention of the appellant's agent but at the time of writing no response has been received. The outstanding concerns would need to be addressed if I was minded to allow the appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and its setting in the street scene.

Reasons

Background

5. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached two storey property which lies in a residential street of similar properties. It has part bow windows on the ground and first floor on the main front elevation and a single storey garage to the east side elevation. It is proposed to convert the garage to a lounge and add a first floor extension above it as well as a small porch to the entranceway.

Effect on character and appearance

6. The relevant part of the development plan, Policy DMP1 of the Local Plan – Development Management Policies 2016 indicates, generally, that development

proposals will be acceptable provided, as relevant to this case, the layout, scale and materials provide high levels of external amenity which complement the locality. In assessing this aspect, I have had regard to the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance – Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD2 (January 2018) (referred to as the SPD) which is a material consideration.

7. The critical issue is whether the new first floor element of the extension proposed would appear subservient to the architectural character of the original dwelling house and maintain its appearance in the street scene.
8. The appellant says that the first floor extension has been set back by 0.7m from the main front wall of the house and the front of the garage to be converted and as such the design of the scheme meets the guidance in the SPD. However, section 2.2 of the SPD makes clear that in order to prevent the creation of a terracing effect, two storey side extensions should be set back by at least 2.5m from the main front wall. The SPD goes on to advise that a reduced set-back of 1.5m may be acceptable where a side extension is set in from the party boundary by at least 1m. In this case the extension is not set in from the party boundary and the recommended set back of 2.5m is not met by a substantial degree.
9. Clearly the provisions of the SPD are mainly guidance and there may be local circumstances which justify a departure. However, in this case I am concerned that the minor set-back of the extension proposed from the front wall would not make this element appear subservient to the main house. Moreover, the width of the extension to the party boundary would be likely to result in a terracing effect on its own but would also result in little visual gap between the properties if the occupiers of the adjoining property at No.105 sought to build a similar extension.
10. Overall, I find that the scale, bulk and siting of the extension proposed would not respect the character of the existing property and would have a visually imposing and harmful effect on the appearance of the street-scene. As such the proposal does not meet the requirements of Policy DMP1 for ensuring an appropriate design and detailing which complements the locality. This conflict with the relevant part of the development plan is not outweighed by any other consideration and this indicates that planning permission should not be granted.
11. Finally, I am not able to make separate decisions on the change of use of the garage or the new front porch as these aspects of the proposal are interlinked with the extension.

Conclusion

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

David Murray

INSPECTOR