



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2021

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/20/3262098

Garage Rear of 66 Okehampton Road, Tiverton Road, London, NW10 3HL

- 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 Sugarman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 20/2228, dated 16 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'addition of a single storey roof extension and amendments to the first floor layouts of previously approved planning permission 19/3756 for the demolition of existing garage and erection of a two-storey detached dwelling house with basement, sunken amenity space to front and rear, erection of front boundary wall, provision of waste storage, car and cycle parking and associated landscaping.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. The Council's decision describes the proposal as 'demolition of existing garage and erection of a two-storey detached dwelling house with roof extension, basement, sunken amenity space to front and rear, erection of front boundary wall, provision of waste storage, car and cycle parking and associated landscaping' and as this describes the proposal more accurately, I have used this as the basis for my decision.

Reasons

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area. The development plan includes policy DMP1 in the Council's Development Management Policies which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that proposals are of a scale and design that complements the locality.
4. The appeal site lies at the rear of a property on Okehampton Road and has a frontage onto Tiverton Road, within a frontage of mainly inter-war built semi-detached houses of a cohesive and consistent design whose generous proportions and traditional form and detailing of main hipped roofs with projecting gabled bays reflect one of the main building styles of that period and contribute to the area's attractive suburban character.

5. Planning permission was approved for a two storey dwelling on the site under ref 19/3756. The approved design is a contemporary style with a flat roof form and simple detailing which the Council found acceptable due to its overall scale and simple design approach which was not overly prominent nor detracted from the consistency of Tiverton Road.
6. The main effect of the current proposal would be the addition of a third storey within a gabled roof which would be glazed on its front elevation. The Design and Access Statement states that it seeks to reference the typology of the 1930's semis and the Council acknowledges that it takes its cues from the gabled projections of those houses.
7. It seems to me, however, that this approach is flawed and that the traditionally-based design of the additional storey is poorly related to the contemporary style of the rest of the dwelling. Neither its gabled form nor its symmetrically placed window relate well to the squarer form and asymmetrically placed window of the first floor of the dwelling. Furthermore, the proposed gable has a different degree of pitch and proportions from those of the neighbouring houses. Therefore, although the ridge height of the dwelling would sit below those of the adjacent dwellings, the additional storey and proposed roof design would result in a dwelling with a taller, more vertical emphasis than the approved design and at odds with the wider proportions of the other houses. The additional storey would dilute the strong, contemporary style of the approved design and the resulting dwelling would be neither truly contemporary nor authentically traditional.
8. I agree, therefore, with the Council that it appears somewhat contrived and that there is a lack of cohesiveness within the design. By reason of its scale and design, it would appear overly prominent within the street scene and would fail to complement the locality.
9. The appellant has referred to a number of examples of contemporary style dwellings approved in the area but I have seen nothing that would persuade me to conclude that those are directly comparable in terms of their context or design to this proposal that would lead me to reach a different conclusion.
10. I disagree with the appellant that this proposal is necessary for the improvement of the site's appearance and condition. The existing garage is not unsightly and the site is only slightly overgrown and, in any case, even if its improvement were necessary that could be achieved through the extant permission.
11. Whilst the appellant argues that the proposal would make more effective use of land and would provide a larger dwelling that would contribute to the Borough's housing supply, in this case those matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons stated above, I conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to policy DMP1 and the development plan. The appeal is dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector