



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2020

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/20/3255796
318B Dollis Hill Lane, London NW2 6HH

- 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 Mrs Nawrozzadeh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 20/0743, dated 3 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is retention of side extension of existing garage to include green side and front wall, creation of rear entrance and installation of a window to the rear of garage for ground and first floor flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development has been taken from the Council's decision notice and the appeal form as it adequately and simply describes the development rather than the more detailed description on the application form.
3. At the time of the site visit I noted that the shell of the garage and the steps had been substantially constructed. The application has been submitted retrospectively and I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a detached property sub divided into flats. The property is elevated from the road and a number of properties along the road benefit from varying designs of garages, driveways and steps leading up to their front entrances. However, most retain green and soft landscaping, and this combined with the setback of houses from the road contribute to the spacious character of the area.
6. I acknowledge that frontages along the street vary and there has been a garage at the property for some time. However, the proposed development extending across the entire frontage and the loss of soft landscaping results in an unduly prominent and dominant structure within the street. The green wall

and roof, whilst providing a greater green area, would not disguise the bulk of the garage. It would appear as an overly engineered and incongruous feature within an otherwise domestic landscaped setting harming the appearance of the street.

7. I acknowledge that the proposal seeks to maximise space, that the existing roller shutter doors and other features would not be disturbed and the entrance into the store/gym would be from the rear. However, these factors do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
8. I appreciate that the appellant has attempted to address subsidence issues and to overcome the concerns previously raised but the amendments would still result in a proposal that would be harmful.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policy DMP1 of the London Borough of Brent Local Plan Development Management Policies (2016) which, amongst other things, requires new development to complement the locality.
10. It would also be contrary to Supplementary Planning Document 2 – 'Residential Extensions and Alterations' (2018) which, amongst other things, states that new front extensions will not be permitted unless they are the predominant character of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above the appeal does not succeed.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR