



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 September 2020 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/20/3248336

12 Rowdon Avenue, London NW10 2AL

- 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 A Malik against the decision the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 19/4388, dated 13 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is for the conversion of garage to habitable room and extension of front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary matters

3. One of the Council's reasons for refusal relates to the fact that the proposed rear elevation does not show the proposed extension. The appeal statement refers to a revised drawing (reference: 190ROW P1.03 Rev B) which sought to address this issue. I have not been provided with a copy of this drawing; nonetheless, this issue alone has not been determinative as the submitted drawings are sufficient in assessing the proposal. Accordingly, I have considered the main issue regarding the appeal proposal as outlined below.
4. The Council has granted permission for a similar, alternative, scheme¹ at the appeal property. I have had regard to the approved scheme in so far as it relates to the appeal development.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal relates to a two-storey, detached dwelling, located within a residential area. Neighbouring properties vary in terms of scale, design and the

¹ Application ref: 20/0781

width of their plots. Most of them have single storey, flat-roofed elements to the side, which generally do not project beyond the main walls of the dwellings. This arrangement allows for the bay windows, which are a defining characteristic of the houses and a positive feature within the street scene, to stand out.

7. The proposal includes an extension to the front of the existing garage and its conversion into a habitable room and a porch extension, which together would project beyond the main wall of the host dwelling. It also involves an increase in the height of the existing front parapet to create a mezzanine storage space with a window.
8. The extension would not project beyond the front of the bay window but given its projection beyond the main front elevation of the dwelling, it would be an obvious and sprawling form of development which would not reflect the compact form of the dwelling. Its forward projection would also compete, in visual terms, with the bay window and as such would detract from its appearance and prominence. Whilst I note that the extension would not project further forward than the neighbouring property this would not negate its harmful effect on the host dwelling.
9. Furthermore, due to its height, the parapet as viewed from the front of the appeal property, would be a substantial feature which would extend well above first floor level and would obscure a significant part of the existing first-floor window thus appearing disproportionate to the original dwelling. The detailing at the mezzanine level, including the bricked-up window, would not restore the balance in terms of proportions. The fact that the first-floor window does not serve a habitable room does not justify the harmful impact that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the dwelling.
10. Whilst the adjacent properties Nos 10 and 14 also have flat-roofed structures to the side, they do not project beyond the main building line, and therefore they are not as prominent as the appeal development would be. In addition, the front parapet of No 14 does not appear to be as high as that proposed for the appeal dwelling.
11. Accordingly, the extension would not appear subservient and in keeping to the host dwelling due to the forward projection coupled with the increase in the height of the existing parapet. As a result, the proposal would be an incongruous addition to the appeal property and the extended dwelling would lack a cohesive form and character. Given the prominent position of the appeal site within the street scene, the incongruous appearance of the development would be clearly visible. For the reasons set out above the proposal would thereby also harm the character and appearance of the area.
12. I note that some of the neighbouring properties have extensions that project forward of the main building wall; their design and scale vary. Nonetheless, given my findings above, the presence of such examples does not justify the harmful impact of the appeal development.
13. Whilst there have not been any objections from third parties, this is a neutral matter rather than one that carries weight in favour of the scheme.
14. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Therefore, the

development would be contrary to Policy DMP1 of the London Borough of Brent Local Plan Development Management Policies, which requires, amongst other things, that new developments have an appropriate scale and design that provide high levels of external amenity and complement the locality.

Recommendation

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

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR