



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 10 November 2020

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/20/3253483
110 The Avenue, London NW6 7NN

- 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 Carey Trustees Limited against the decision of London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 20/0960, dated 20 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as, 'side extension to the single family dwelling'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The stretch of road within which the site lies is primarily characterised by large detached and semi-detached houses in spacious plots that give the area an attractive, spacious feel.
4. The proposal includes a side extension at first floor level with a pitched roof at the front. While the first-floor extension would be significantly set back internally, since the pitched roof starts close to the front elevation, only the top of the extension would be set a significant distance from the front when viewed from the street. Therefore, the side extension at first floor level would appear prominent when viewed against the host building and would compete visually with the other elements of the property such as the roof of the porch, unbalancing the overall composition. The proposal would therefore appear discordant against the host building.
5. Since the first-floor extension would extend to the neighbouring building, given its siting near the front elevation, the pitched roof would also appear prominent against this neighbouring property. Therefore, it would diminish the visual separation of the two buildings. Given that the ground floor of the property is at a lower level than the street, the proposed roof, which would extend to the neighbouring building, would be prominent at eye level presenting a stark elevation to the street. The proposal would therefore have an adverse effect the spacious character and appearance of the area.

6. The Council has not objected to the ground floor side extension, and from the evidence before me, given its width and proposed materials, I have no reason to disagree. I acknowledge that the proposed width of the two-storey extension is less than two thirds of that of the original dwelling, and that there are no habitable rooms on the side elevation of the neighbouring building. I also acknowledge that the height of the proposal is lower than that of the host building. However, given the harm identified above, these matters have not altered my overall decision.
7. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Therefore, it would conflict with Policy DMP 1 of the Development Management Policies November 2016 which, among other things, seeks development that complements the locality. It would also conflict with Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2 Jan 2018 in this respect.

Other Matters

8. I note the evidence relating to the provision of additional internal space. However, given the harm identified above, this has not altered my overall decision.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR