



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: 28 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/20/3253397 104 Norval Road, Wembley HA0 3SY

- 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 Pretesh Mistry against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref: 20/0680 dated 27 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed for single storey side extension at 104 Norval Road, Wembley HA0 3SY in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 20/0680 dated 27 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 plan: 1956/02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed single storey side extension on the character and appearance of the existing property and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached residential house on the south side of Norval Road, within a predominantly residential area, with a prevailing pattern of semi-detached houses of similar scale and appearance. There is an existing detached garage along the side boundary with No 106 Norval Road, which together with its neighbour turns the corner into Spencer Road. No 106 has been extended to the side, including with a flat roofed single storey side extension and garage.
4. The proposed extension would be single storey with a side extension in line with the front of the dwelling to form an additional room and following the

- angle of the boundary a forward projecting garage with a gable fronted pitched roof. The extension would be continued at the rear to provide a larger kitchen.
5. I acknowledge that the form of the proposal would not comply with all the detailed guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 2: Residential Extensions Design Guide (2018) (SPD). However, because of the varied siting and change in direction of the roof form, from the front the extension would, in my view, be read as two elements, the narrower side extension and the forward projecting garage.
 6. The garage would be a sufficient distance from the bay window of the existing house that it would not compete or detract from that feature. Furthermore, the front gable design to the proposed garage would use a similar feature to the gable over the bay window of the existing house; this would assist in unifying the design of the new extension with the existing property. In terms of its forward projection it would align with the front elevation of the adjoining neighbour's side extension and assist in turning the corner between Norval Road and Spencer Road. I appreciate that the proposed ridge height of the garage would be higher than the neighbouring flat roofed garage although the eaves height at the boundary where it immediately adjoins the neighbouring garage would not be dissimilar in height. From the rear the scale and design of the rear extension would be in keeping with and appear subordinate with the existing property.
 7. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would appear subordinate to the existing house, both from the front and the rear, and would be well designed to complement the scale, design features and materials of the existing house. As a result, I also consider that it would not appear overly prominent within and would respect the street scene.
 8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the existing property and the street scene. The proposal would accord with the objectives for good design as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular Section 12, and Policy DMP1 of the Brent Development Management Policies 2016.
 9. As already indicated, the proposal would not fully accord with all the guidance in the SPD, but the guidance in the SPD seeks to ensure that proposals respect the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area. In this regard, I have found no harm from the proposal before me. In the particular circumstances of this case, I am therefore satisfied that there would be justification for an exception to be made to some of the detailed considerations within the SPD.
 10. The Appellant has drawn my attention to a number of extensions undertaken in the local vicinity which he considers are similar to his own proposal. However, my decision is based on the planning merits of the proposal before me.

Conditions and Conclusion

11. In terms of conditions, I agree with the standard conditions proposed by the Council. Matching materials with the existing dwelling are required in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area. I also agree that a condition to list the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

12. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR