



Appeal Decision

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

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/20/3244361

11 Trevelyan Gardens, London NW10 3LA

- 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 Wojciech Szczerbe against the decision the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 19/3442, dated 25 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is for a first floor side extension.
-

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal relates to a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling, located at the end of a residential cul-de-sac. The original hipped roof of the appeal dwelling has been converted into a gable end. The dwelling also has a two-storey, gabled projection to the front, with bay windows at both levels. Neighbouring properties located on Trevelyan Gardens are similar in terms of scale and design; some of them have been extended to the side.
 5. The proposal seeks to construct a first-floor extension to the side, above the existing single storey, flat-roofed structure. The appeal dwelling is at an angle to its western side boundary; thus, the first-floor side extension would be wider to the front. The extension would be set in from the edges of the ground floor extension and set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling. It would have a hipped roof and would be set down from both the main ridge and the two-storey front gable.
 6. The proposed extension would have a significant sideways projection, particularly when viewed from the front of the property. The introduction of a hipped-roof of such width would not be in keeping with the host dwelling and
-

as such would appear as an uncharacteristic and jarring element. I acknowledge that planning permission¹ was previously granted for a two-storey hipped-roofed side extension. However, at that time the approved extension matched the roof style of the host dwelling. The proposal fails to do so in this case; thus, it would be detrimental to the form and overall appearance of the dwelling.

7. Whilst the extension would not comply with the requirements of Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD2 (Jan 2018) in terms of its set back, but nevertheless it would not result in terracing. However, when viewed as a whole, the proposal would be an incongruous addition to the appeal property and the extended dwelling would lack a cohesive form and character.
8. The matching materials and fenestration pattern are not sufficient to make the proposal acceptable. I acknowledge that a hipped roof would reduce the bulk of the structure and might thereby minimise the effect of the extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. Nevertheless, it does not justify the harmful impact that the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
9. Whilst the proposal would be clearly visible, given the position of the appeal site within the street scene, the side extension would have a limited impact on the character and appearance of the street scene.
10. The appellant has drawn my attention to the two-storey side extension of the neighbouring property located directly opposite the appeal site, which is flush with the main wall, and to a side extension at No 41 Chelmsford Square, which has been allowed at appeal². The proposal is not directly comparable with the extension located opposite the appeal site, mainly because in that case the extension matches the roof style of the host dwelling. The appeal development is also not directly comparable with the extension at No 41 Chelmsford Square, particularly because of the difference in their overall scale.
11. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Therefore, the development would be contrary to Policy CP17 of the London Borough of Brent Core Strategy 2010 and Policy DMP1 of the London Borough of Brent Local Plan Development Management Policies, which collectively require, amongst other things, that new developments have an appropriate scale and design that provide high levels of external amenity and complement the locality.

Recommendation

12. 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

¹ Application ref: 04/0353

² Appeal ref: APP/T5150/D/18/3196628

13. 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