



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: 30th November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/20/3255288
28 The Avenue, London NW6 7YD

- 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 John Clegg against the decision of London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 20/0951, dated 16 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is double storey rear extension to two flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for double storey rear extension to two flats. at 28 The Avenue, London NW6 7YD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/0951, dated 16 March 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: 028/L /010 Rev 00, 028/P/050 Rev 01, 028/P/051 Rev 01, 028/P/150 Rev 01, 028/P/151 Rev 01, 028/P/250 Rev 02, 028/P/250 Rev 02, 028/P/350 Rev 02, 028/P/400 Rev 02.
 - 3) No development shall commence above ground until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural Matter

2. While I note the address stated on the decision notice, I have used the address from the application form and appeal form in the interests of certainty.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal building is semi-detached and four storeys high with a two-storey bay window feature at the rear of the building, as does its adjacent neighbour. There are a number of similar buildings along the street, some of which have single and two storey rear extensions. While they may have been granted planning permission prior to the adoption of the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2 (SPD), single and two storey rear extensions nevertheless are present and form part of and contribute to the varied character and appearance of the rear of the group of buildings and surrounding area.

5. The proposal consists of a two-storey rear extension with a flat roof in a contemporary style. The height of the extension and vertical extent of the proposed glazing would be roughly in line with the upper window of the bay feature. While the proposal would project further than the bay feature, since it would be a modest projection and given the overall height of the host building, the massing of the extension would not appear incongruous when viewed against the rear façade or bay feature.
6. I note the requirement within the SPD for the design, shape and materials of the roof to match the original roof. However, in this particular instance, the proposed flat roof would be viewed against the roof of the bay feature rather than the main roof of the building. Given the lower height of the proposed roof compared with the roof of the bay feature and its comparatively modest projection, the flat roof would not appear discordant when viewed against the host building. Furthermore, given the other rear extensions with flat roofs in the vicinity of the site, the scheme would not appear incongruous in the surrounding area.
7. The proposed extension has contemporary style, reflected in the extent of glazing on the proposed rear façade. While the extension would contrast with the more historic host building, the proportions of the window frames would roughly echo the narrow proportions of the existing windows and the proposed slender mullions would reflect the existing slim window frames. As such, the glazed rear façade would have a complementary relationship to the host property.
8. The flank walls would not utilise the same materials of the host building. However, the proposed timber cladding would be a light, natural material that would appear sympathetic against the brick of the host building. Moreover, further details of the timber as well as the other materials including window framing could be secured by a suitably worded condition. The proposed materials, therefore, would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building or surrounding area.
9. Consequently, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. Therefore, it would not conflict with Policy DMP 1 of the Development Management Policies November 2016 which seeks, among other things, developments that complement the locality.

Other Matters

10. I note concerns regarding the proposal overshadowing the bay window. However, given its modest projection and orientation, the proposal would not unduly affect the living conditions of the occupiers in this respect.

Conditions

11. As well as the standard conditions relating to commencement and specifying plans of the proposed extension, a condition relating to materials is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

R. Sabu

INSPECTOR