The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2020

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/20/3251300
41 Carlton Avenue East, Wembley HA9 8LZ

- 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 Fahim Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
- The application Ref: 20/0173 dated 17 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 March 2020.
- The development proposed is first floor rear extension & conversion of single dwelling into two self-contained flats (1 x 3-bed and 1 x 2-bed) including the retention and completion of single storey rear extension, creation of side entrance door and window, subdivision of rear garden, provision of covered refuse and cycle storage, addition of soft landscaping and boundary treatment to front forecourt and extension to width of existing crossover.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

2. Planning permission has been granted for a similar scheme under the Council's reference 19/2979, but the proposal the subject of this appeal also includes for a first floor rear extension. The Council's reason for refusal relates solely to the first floor rear extension and I have no reason to take a different view, particularly taking into account the permission already granted as referenced above.

3. Accordingly, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed first floor rear extension on the character and appearance of the existing property and the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached residential house on the western side of Carlton Avenue East within a predominantly residential area.

5. The proposed first floor extension would have a shallow hipped roof. There is an existing large rear roof dormer in place and the proposed roof form to the first floor extension, where the two would abut, would create a clumsy and awkward juxtaposition. The proposed roof to the rear extension would be well set down from the main roof ridge, but I agree with the Council that the relationship between the roof of the proposal and the existing dormer, and in

particular the discordant juncture, would be a poor design approach that would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.

6. The proposal would not be seen from the front of the property but would be seen from neighbouring gardens. In these views, I consider that the poor and unsatisfactory relationship of the roof of the first floor extension with the dormer roof would appear incongruous and detract from the pattern of development in the vicinity It would therefore harm character and appearance of the local area.

7. I conclude that the proposed first floor rear extension would harm the character and appearance of the existing property and of 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, as well as 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) (SPD). The Appellant has referenced a number of other policies which are considered to be relevant, including from the London Plan and in so far as the information has been made available to me, I have taken them into account. However, they do not individually or together alter the conclusion I have reached in this case.

8. Given the depth of the ground floor rear extension, I do not consider that the modest increase in depth of the proposed extension over the recommendations in the SPD would lead to any harm in terms of scale and massing. However, my finding in this regard does not outweigh the harm I have already concluded. I have also taken into account that the proposal would extend the living space for the upper flat, although the first floor flat without the proposed extension has already been found to be acceptable and been granted permission under 19/2979.

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

L J Evans

INSPECTOR