



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2020 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN MIPI

Decision by Alex Hutson MRTPI CMLI MArborA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/20/3245600

2 Warren Road, London NW2 7LH

- 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 Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
- The application Ref 19/1691, dated 29 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 August 2019.
- The proposed development is demolition of existing dwelling and erection of new replacement dwelling.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey, end-of-terrace dwelling on the corner of Warren Road and Links Road. Warren Road is a residential street characterised by dwellings of similar scale, form and design. The appeal site is irregularly shaped, with the width of the site increasing from the front to the rear. The proposal would demolish the existing dwelling and replace it with a new one.
 5. Much of the flank wall of the proposed dwelling would run parallel with the boundary which fronts Links Road. As the width of the site increases from the front to the rear, the rear of the proposed dwelling would be considerably wider than the front. Due to the resulting splayed flank elevation, the proportions of the proposed dwelling would appear overtly bulky and irregular, especially at first floor and roof-level, and so would contrast poorly with the more rectilinear proportions of nearby dwellings which are characteristic of the surrounding area. Furthermore, as the proposed dwelling would appear prominent in this corner plot location, its irregular form and excessive scale would appear as a
-

particularly incongruent addition to the streetscene and at considerable odds with the prevailing pattern of development in the area.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to two nearby developments in support of the proposal. These are 49 Brook Road and 1 Dawpool Road. However, unlike the proposed dwelling, the flank walls of these examples are set at right angles to their front façade and so are typical of the rectilinear form of dwellings within the surrounding area. As such, these examples are not helpfully comparable to the proposed dwelling before me and they do not provide a justification for allowing the appeal. In any event, each case should be considered on its own merits.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 and Policy DMP1 of the London Borough of Brent Development Management Policies 2016. These policies require, amongst other things, development to be designed to a high standard and to respond positively to local character.

Other Matters

8. The decision notice cites the lack of a construction method statement as the second reason for refusal. However, as such a statement could have been secured by condition had the proposal been otherwise acceptable, I do not consider that this matter solely warrants refusal. Furthermore, the submission and approval of a drainage strategy prior to development could have similarly been secured by condition to overcome the third reason for refusal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Alex Hutson

INSPECTOR