



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2020

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/20/3251940

31 Bengeworth Road, Harrow HA1 3SF

- 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 Marwaha against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref: 20/0627 dated 24 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is extension of existing garage to the side and rear and front porch extension to dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as it relates to extension of existing garage to the side and rear.
2. The appeal is allowed in so far as it relates to front porch extension to dwelling house at 31 Bengeworth Road, Harrow HA1 3SF in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 20/0627 dated 24 February 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans in so far as they relate to the proposed front porch extension to dwelling house: RAM.PA.2020.RA101 P01; RAM.PA.2020.SE 102 P01; RAM.PA.2020.SE 103 P01; RAM.PA.2020.SE 104 P01 and RAM.PA.2020.SE 105 P01.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the front porch extension to the dwelling house hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. The description of development on the application forms included the rationale for the proposed extension. This has been taken into account in my decision, but it is not necessary for this to be recorded on the decision header above.
4. The Council extended the description of development to include for the front porch extension which the Appellant has included in the grounds of appeal. I have therefore also extended the description in the above header to include for the front porch extension.

5. The Council's reason for refusal only refers to the side and rear extension to the garage and the Officer's report confirms that there are no concerns with the proposed porch extension. From all the information before me, as well as my site visit, I also agree that the proposed porch extension would be appropriate in form, scale and design to respect the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area. There would also be no impact on the living conditions of surrounding neighbours.
6. Accordingly, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed side and rear extension to the garage on the character and appearance of the existing property and the local area.

Reasons

7. The appeal property is a detached residential dwelling on the western side of Bengeworth Road, on a triangular shaped site, siding onto the rear gardens of properties on Sudbury Court Drive. It is within a predominantly residential area, with a variety of generally well-proportioned dwellings along Bengeworth Road.
8. The property has an existing double garage to the side with a pitched roof over at the front and sloping roof to the rear. The proposal would extend the garage to the side and to the rear to infill the existing gaps to the side boundary. I appreciate that much of the extension would be to the rear of the existing garage. However, the increased side extension would result in a side extension which would be almost the width of the main house and would appear disproportionately wide in relation to the main dwelling.
9. I consider that the excessive width of this extension would result in a visually incongruous addition that would detract from the proportions and scale of the existing dwelling and so harm its character and appearance. It would also be visually discordant in the street scene and conflict with the general pattern of development and harm the character and appearance of the local area.
10. The proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the existing house and the local area. It would conflict with the objectives for good design as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular Section 12, Policy DMP1 of the Brent Development Management Policies 2016 and the more specific guidance in the Supplementary Planning Document 2: Residential Extensions Design Guide (2018).
11. I have sympathy with the Appellant's security related reasons for seeking the proposed side and rear extension to the garage, but I am not persuaded that this is the only way that these security objectives could be achieved. This reason does not therefore outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conditions and Conclusions

12. I have found that there would be no objection to the proposed front porch extension and the Council also raised no objection to this part of the proposal. This element of the proposed works would be self-contained and on the basis of the submitted plans, could be built separately from the side and rear garage extension. I am therefore able to issue a split decision.
13. With regard to conditions for the proposed front porch extension, I agree with the Council that this should be constructed in materials to match those at the

existing dwelling in order to respect the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area. I shall also include a condition to list the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning in so far as the submitted plans relate to the proposed front porch extension.

14. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed in so far as it relates to the proposed front porch extension but dismissed in so far as it relates to the proposed side and rear garage extension.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR