
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2020

by R Sabu BA(Hons) MA BArch PgDip ARB RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/19/3243878

32 Aston Avenue, Harrow HA3 0DB

- 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 Ketan Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 19/3038, dated 23 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as, 'double storey, full depth side extension, rear dormer and additional "Velux" windows'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. While I note the description of development in the decision notice, I have used the description from the application form in the interests of certainty.
3. While I note the appellant's name in the appeal form, the appellant has confirmed that the correct name is as per the application form. Therefore, the name on the application form has been used in the header.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The site lies in a prominent location on Aston Avenue which is characterised by two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings in a traditional style with varied forms such that the area has an attractive character and appearance.
6. The proposed two storey extension would be in line with the existing front elevation of the host property, thereby increasing the appearance of its mass. While I note that the ridge height of the roof would be lower than the host property, the lack of a setback and two storey height would result in the extension appearing dominant when viewed against the existing house.
7. While I note that the semi-detached properties to the side of the appeal site have been extended, since those extensions have been set back from the original buildings, the overall mass appears in keeping with the character of the street. I note the proposed materials and fenestration design and layout, the

proposed hipped roof with lower ridge height, the size of the extended bedroom, as well as the depth of the host property with a previous two storey extension. I also acknowledge the recessed side extension of No 30 Aston Avenue (No 30). However, given the lack of a setback, the two-storey height of the proposal, and the prominent position of the host dwelling on the bend of the road, the extension would appear dominant against the semi-detached dwellings as well as No 30. It would therefore appear discordant and would adversely affect the attractive character and appearance of the area.

8. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Therefore, it would conflict with Policy DMP1 of the London Borough Of Brent Local Plan Development Management Policies November 2016 which among other things seeks development that complements the locality. It would also conflict with the Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD 2 Jan 2018 and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) in this particular regard.

Other Matters

9. I note that the purpose of the proposed extension is to provide accommodation for elderly dependent relatives. However, these personal wishes do not outweigh my earlier findings based on making decisions in the wider public interest.
10. While I note the reference to paragraph 11(d) of the Framework, there is no evidence before me to indicate that the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date. I acknowledge there may be some minor economic benefits during the construction phase and limited social benefit in the provision of additional accommodation within the dwelling and freeing up of other dwellings.
11. However, taking the appellant's best position as a benchmark, even if the provisions of paragraph 11(d) were engaged, given the significant harm to the character and appearance of the area identified above and the conflict with the development plan as a whole, the adverse impacts of the proposed development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

Conclusion

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

R Sabu

INSPECTOR