



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 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/20/3262598

15C Ilex Road, London, NW10 9NT

- 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 Miss Charlotte Harris against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 20/2648, dated 24 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'ground floor side infill extension and minor first floor extension.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side infill extension, first floor extension, alteration to fenestration and internal reconfiguration to flat at 15C Ilex Road, London, NW10 9NT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/2648, dated 24 August 2020, subject to the following conditions:-
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 022_PL_103; 022_PL_102.
 - 3) All new external work shall be carried out in materials that match, in colour, texture and design detail those of the existing building.
 - 4) No development shall take place until an Archaeological Impact and Method Assessment has been submitted to and agreed in writing to the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with an approved Archaeological Impact Assessment and Method Statement.

Preliminary matter

2. The Council's decision describes the proposal as a 'single storey side infill extension, first floor extension, alteration to fenestration and internal reconfiguration to flat' 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 dwelling and the area. The development plan includes policies CP17 in the Council's Core Strategy (CS) and DMP1 in its Development Management Policies document which seek to ensure that

proposals protect and enhance the character of Brent and complement the locality.

4. The appeal site is located within a residential street of mainly Victorian terraced properties. It comprises a duplex apartment that forms part of a larger end terrace, Victorian property that has been converted into flats and subsequently extended. Its corner location is prominent and the existing extensions of various forms and sizes can be clearly seen from the street to the side. The building elements occupied by the appeal site are significantly smaller in scale than the main part of the building.
5. The proposal comprises extensions to the rear of the building. An existing two storey outrigger extension would be replaced with an extension of a similar form but with an additional small scale projection towards the side boundary. Although not identical to the existing roof as sought in the Council's guidance in its SPD 2 'Residential Extensions and Alterations' (2018), the new roof over the additional projection would have a catslide roof that would follow the existing roofline. As this extension would not occupy more than half of the width or length of the existing outrigger and would follow the existing roofline it would appear sufficiently subservient to the original building. Within the context of the existing variety of extensions to the building it would not be unduly prominent and would sit comfortably within the street scene.
6. An existing single storey rear extension would be extended up to the side boundary with the street. This would contravene the guidance in SPD 2 and would bring it closer to the footway. However, as it continues the existing flat roof and would be significantly smaller in scale than the other parts of the building when seen from the street, it would not be particularly noticeable in the street scene and would remain a subsidiary element of the whole building.
7. Overall, the proposed development represents two small scale extensions to this large building which would assimilate acceptably into the street scene and would not harm the character or appearance of the dwelling or the area.

Conditions

8. The Council has suggested several conditions should the appeal be allowed. A standard commencement condition is necessary as is a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in order to provide certainty. A condition requiring that external materials match those of the existing building is necessary to safeguard the traditional appearance of the building. As the site lies within an Archaeological Priority Area, a condition requiring an Archaeological Impact and Method Assessment is necessary.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons stated above, I conclude that the proposal would accord with the development plan policies referred to earlier. The appeal is allowed subject to the conditions in the formal decision.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector