
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2021

by K Winnard LL.B Hons Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/21/3269953
8 Falcon Way Harrow HA3 0TP

- 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 P Parekh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref.20/3112, dated 29 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing side extension and front porch, erection of single storey side to rear extension and front porch to dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council amended the description of the development and I note that the appellant's agent has also utilised this description on the appeal form. I have used the Council's description of the development as this provides a more succinct description.
3. The development, the subject of the proposal, includes a rear extension element. The Council has raised no objection with regard to this part of the proposal. I agree with the Council and am content to deal only with that part of the proposed extension which fronts the property including the new front porch in my decision.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed development on the character of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property (No 8) is located in a residential area, where the properties are similar in size and scale. Several of the properties have been altered with side extensions either set back or level with the front elevation. In addition, a large number of the properties have front porches. Whilst there is variety in the size and design of these porches, the street itself retains a generally cohesive character of semi-detached/terraced development with

modest front porches. There are no examples on Falcon Way of side extensions projecting beyond the front elevation and linked to porches.

6. The proposed side extension would project beyond the front elevation and be linked to the new front porch addition. Notwithstanding that it would be modest in size, its design would be incongruous to the underlying building pattern on Falcon Way. Whilst No 8 does not have architectural features such as a bay window, the resultant wider extension projecting forward of the front elevation would disrupt the regularity of the front porches. In this instance the cohesive character of the street would be harmed by the proposal. Whilst the soft planting at the front of the proposed extension does provide some screening of No 8, the extension would still be visible in many views from Falcon Way.
7. Accordingly, the proposal would be in conflict with the guidance within the Brent Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2 – 2018 (SPD) which specifies that protruding extensions will not be permitted unless these are the predominant character of the area. I acknowledge that the guidance in the SPD is not prescriptive. I appreciate also that the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) indicates that design in itself should not be used as a valid reason to object where it accords with clear expectations in the development plan policies. However the overall aim of the SPD in line with Policy DMP1 of the Brent Development Policies 2016, is to ensure that extensions do not detract from the character of the host dwelling and the area. In this instance and for the reasons explained, I consider that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
8. The appellant's agent refers to a number of other properties within the wider area which have similar design features and my attention has been drawn to a specific extension close to No 8. However in this instance this property is one of a limited number of properties on a small stretch of road linking residential streets and gives this stretch of road a different character. As such its context differs to that of the proposal before me. Accordingly, it merits only limited weight and does not lead me to a different view in this case.
9. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would be a visually obtrusive form of development and would harm the character of the host dwelling and the area. As such, it would be contrary to Policy DMP1 of the Brent Development Management Policies 2016 which requires development to be of a design which complements the locality, and to guidance contained in the SPD which prohibits front extensions unless they are the predominant character of the area. The proposed development would also be contrary to the Framework which seeks to promote development sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that there is an extant approval for a side extension and front porch and that the side extension is of similar design to the porch. Nonetheless the inclusion of a forward projection to the side extension and linking with a front porch results in a larger extension which for the reasons stated above would have a harmful effect. I note too that the development is acceptable in relation to the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. However, these do not outweigh the findings I have made in respect of the effect of the proposed development on the character of No 8 and the area.

11. As the rear extension element is part of the side extension, I am not able to sever this element of the proposal and must come to a decision on these elements together.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, I hereby dismiss the appeal.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR