



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 June 2021 by A Coombes

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/21/3270181

Site Address 9 Pebworth Road, Harrow HA1 3UB

- 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 Saeed Khan against the decision of London Borough of Brent Council.
 - The application Ref 20/4244, dated 22 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 February 2021.
 - The development is a single storey rear extension to facilitate a disabled shower room.
-

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.

Procedural Matter

3. The appeal was submitted retrospectively and has therefore been considered on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. Pebworth Road is a quiet, residential street lined with trees and large, detached properties. Though the properties vary in design, there is uniformity in building line and height. The appeal site is located on the corner plot by the junction with Amery Road. Several rear extensions and outbuildings have been built within the curtilage and the appeal relates to the disabled shower room, which now forms the rearmost elevation of the main dwellinghouse.
6. Though the host dwelling is substantially sized, the multiple developments within the curtilage dominate due to their combined mass. There is uniformity in design and building height but there is a lack of cohesion, which has led to a cluttered and disjointed appearance. The shower room has been set back from the boundary, which abuts Amery Road, and visibility is reduced due to the boundary wall. However, due to the corner plot location, the appeal site is prominent from nearby properties on both Pebworth Road and Amery Road.

7. The addition of the shower room, though modest in isolation, takes the cumulative size of the rear extension to far beyond the suggested maximum of 8m from the London Borough of Brent Council Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD2 (SPD), adopted 2018. Although the SPD provides guidance rather than definitive policies, it is nevertheless an important material consideration. For the reasons set out above, this development has resulted in harm. On the site visit it was observed that the upper floor of the house, namely the corridor, does not provide circulation space for a wheelchair. However, the ground floor of the appeal site has a large footprint which, in all likelihood, could accommodate an alternative layout.
8. Cumulatively, the development is excessive and is not sympathetic to its context, which has a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider street scene. Therefore, it does not comply with Policy DMP1 of the London Borough of Brent Council Local Plan Development Management Policies Document, adopted 2016. This Policy seeks to protect against development that is not complementary to its locality. Furthermore, due to the cumulative size of developments within the curtilage, the proposal is not in accordance with the limits set out in the SPD.

Other Matters

9. In reaching a conclusion regard has been given to the personal circumstances of the occupiers of the dwelling, notably their health and the desire to remain in the appeal property. There is little evidence that the provision of the appeal extension was the only means to provide the necessary accommodation and avoid alternative solutions such as moving to a care home. Therefore, whilst I sympathise with the appellant's situation, this matter only carries moderate weight. I do not find that this would outweigh the significant harm which has been caused to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposal would not accord with the Development Plan when it is considered as a whole. For the reasons given above, I recommend the appeal should be dismissed.

A Coombes

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR

.