
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2022

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/22/3290099

32 and 34 Sonia Gardens, London NW10 1AH

- 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 Silverstar Homes Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 21/3102, dated 11 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a joint application for 32 and 34 Sonia Gardens. 32 Sonia Gardens: part single and part two storey rear extension. 34 Sonia Gardens, first floor rear extension and proposed front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has submitted amended drawings for the proposed rear extension at 34 Sonia Gardens as part of the appeal. However, these drawings have not been the subject of any formal consultation with the occupiers of neighbouring properties who have an outlook towards No. 34. Accordingly, this appeal has been determined based upon the application scheme assessed by the Council.
3. The Council has confirmed that Policy DMP1 of the Development Management Policies has been superseded by Policy DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan (LP) adopted in February 2022. This policy does not materially alter the basis of the assessment of the appeal scheme.

Main Issue

4. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of 34 Sonia Gardens and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal properties are 2 detached dwellings located within a primarily residential area. The properties have already been altered and the proposed development includes the erection of first floor rear extensions above existing additions. The Council has not specifically objected to the proposed extension to the rear of 32 Sonia Gardens and the alterations to the front elevation of No. 34 and there are no reasons to depart from this assessment.

6. The focus of the Council's objection is the proposed first floor full width extension to the rear of No. 34 which would also include a hipped roof. This element of the appeal scheme would project about 3 metres beyond the existing rear wall of this property and would be sited close to the shared boundaries with dwellings fronting Park View Road.
7. When combined with the property's existing side elevation with its already extended roof, the proposed extension would result in a bulky and visually prominent flank wall adjacent to the shared boundary. The size and bulk of the resulting flank wall would not represent a high quality of design in the outlook of the occupiers of the dwellings fronting Park View Road and it would also be seen from viewpoints close to the junction of Park View Road and Sonia Gardens.
8. As identified, No. 34 has already been altered, including by roof and single storey extensions. The proposed full width rear extension with its pitched roof would add further to the scale and bulk of the alterations to the original 2-storey dwelling. In combination, the existing and proposed extensions would visually and physically dominate the original character and appearance of the property rather than be subservient additions.
9. Although it was observed that other dwellings adjacent to No. 34 had been altered, these alterations were not of the same scale and design as existing and proposed extension at this property. The scale and bulk of the resulting property would represent an incongruous form of development within this residential area characterised by modest sized 2-storey dwellings.
10. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of 34 Sonia Gardens and the surrounding area and, as such, it would conflict with LP Policy DMP1 which refers to development being acceptable where it complements the locality. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR