



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 6 January 2021

by Rory MacLeod BA(Hons), MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/20/3255198 18 Wembley Park Drive, Wembley, HA9 8HA

- 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 Worthington against the decision of Brent Council.
 - The application Ref 20/0650, dated 25 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing side store and rear extension; erection of two storey side and rear extensions and front porch extension to the dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing side store and rear extension; erection of two storey side and rear extensions and front porch extension to the dwellinghouse at 18 Wembley Park Drive, Wembley, HA9 8HA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/0650, dated 25 February 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: Site plan and 18/WEM/002 REV A.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in materials to match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description is taken from the appeal form.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are (a) the effect of the two storey extension on the character and appearance of the dwelling and street scene, and (b) the impact of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of adjacent dwellings.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal concerns a detached house in a residential road with great variety in the size, form and design of dwellings. The depth of the proposed side and rear extension would not be out of keeping with its immediate context as both adjacent houses have much greater depths at ground and first floor levels.

5. The extension's design would be broadly sympathetic to that of the existing dwelling and would accord with guidance in the Council's Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD2 (2018) in relation to the side extension's width, a set back from the main front wall and in the use of matching roof planes and materials. The absence of a set down to the side extension roof would depart from SPD guidance but in this instance no harm would result from the lack of its advocated subservient appearance as the dwelling is unique in the row, not forming part of a pair of semi-detached houses or of a row of similarly designed houses in which there would be a greater expediency to retain intact its original profile. There would be a balanced and symmetrical appearance to the proposed front elevation, complementary to the house's design.
6. The inclusion of a crown roof would result in a relatively bulky roof form that would not be characteristic of the road, although there are some flat roofs. However, given the greater mass of most neighbouring dwellings and variety of roof forms nearby, the proposal would not appear overly prominent in the street scene. The crown roof would include side and rear roof slopes to match those existing on the house and so would not be incongruous in appearance.
7. The proposal would be in keeping with Policy DMP1 of the Brent Development Management Policies (2016) and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan (2016) which require development to complement the locality in relation to matters including layout, scale, materials, and design. No material harm would arise in respect of deviations from the guidance in the SPD.

Living conditions

8. There are several secondary windows in the flank elevation to 20 Wembley Park Drive facing the site; these are set back from the common boundary, as would be the flank wall to the proposed rear extension. The rear wall to no.20 in which habitable room windows are located would align approximately with the rear wall to the proposed extension. Whilst the proposal may not have included sufficient information for the Council to make an assessment in respect to the "2 to 1 rule" in the SPD, there would be sufficient separation for the proposal not to adversely affect living conditions at no.20.
9. The two storey extension would be closer to the flank wall to 16 Wembley Park Drive in which there are windows at ground and first floor level. These would appear to be secondary windows, with a primary window in another elevation, or to relate to non-habitable rooms. I concur with the Council's opinion that any light loss arising would not warrant refusing permission on those grounds.
10. The proposal would comply with those parts of Policy DMP1 and the SPD that seek to safeguard the living conditions of occupiers of adjacent dwellings.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should succeed subject to conditions stipulating the statutory period for commencing development, to list the plan numbers in the interests of certainty and to require the use of matching materials.

Rory MacLeod BA(Hons), MRTPI

INSPECTOR