
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 January 2022

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/21/3288489

11 Trevelyan Gardens, London, NW10 3LA

- 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 W Szczerba against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 21/3418, dated 9 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'construction of first floor side extension and alterations to form gable roof'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling, located at the end of a short cul-de-sac comprising of properties of a similar design and appearance.
4. The original hipped roof of the appeal property has been converted to a gable end. The property also has a prominent front gable with bay windows at both ground and first floor level. It also has an existing single storey extension to the side which extends up to the boundary of the site, beyond which are the rear gardens of dwellings in Chelmsford Square.
5. The proposal seeks to construct a first floor extension above the existing single storey side extension. Its design reflects the alignment of the ground floor extension and the boundary of the site and as such it would be wider at the front. It would also be set in from the edges of the ground floor extension by about 1.5 metres to the front and between 1.6 – 1.8 metres to the side.
6. The proposed extension would have a lower ridge and eaves height than the host dwelling and the width of the extension would generally be proportionate to that of the front elevation. Thus, the extension would appear subservient to the main dwelling in terms of its size, scale and bulk. The roof of the extension would be pitched to the front and the rear, with a central flat roof section.

When viewed from the front, the extension would appear to have a pitched roof. However, its large, flat roof top would be apparent when viewed from the side.

7. I find that the design of the extension with its large flat roof element would be at odds with the roof form of the host dwelling which has a gable end. The extension, with its high level splayed side and central flat roof would appear as a visually discordant and incongruous addition which would not be well integrated with the existing dwelling. I appreciate that the side profile of the extension would not be readily visible from Trevelyan Gardens however this does not alleviate my concerns regarding the harm caused to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
8. The design of the proposed extension would also conflict with the guidance set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 2 - *Residential Extensions and Alterations (2018)* (SPD). Whilst not forming part of the statutory development plan, the SPD gives useful guidance in respect of extensions and alterations. In relation to two storey side extensions, it advises that flat roofed or 'false pitch roofs' are unacceptable. It further states that the extension should have a hipped side roof plane where the existing roof is hipped to the side and a gable end where it is gabled.
9. Whilst the small side dormer would be removed, this would not, in my view, outweigh the harm the appeal proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the dwelling.
10. Glimpses of the side roof profile would also be obtainable through the gap above the single storey elements between 28 and 30 Chelmsford Square. Furthermore, in the absence of any substantial screening, the proposed extension would clearly be visible from the rear gardens of the adjacent dwellings in Chelmsford Square. The incongruous design of the extension in relation to the existing dwelling would be particularly apparent when viewed from the gardens of these properties, leading to further harm the character and appearance of the wider area in this regard.
11. I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policy DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan Development Management Policies (2016) and Policy CP17 of the Brent Core Strategy (2010) which together require development to have a high level of internal and external amenity and seek to protect the distinctive suburban character of Brent from inappropriate development. It would also be contrary to the detailed design guidance set out within the SPD.

Other Matters

12. I acknowledge that following an earlier appeal¹ the appellant sought pre-application advice and followed the guidance given in designing the proposal. However, whilst unfortunate, advice given at the pre-application stage is not binding on the Council. Furthermore, I am also required to determine the appeal based on its merits.

¹ Appeal ref. APP/T5150/D/20/3244361

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR