
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/D/22/3301498

6 Blackstone Road, London NW2 6BY

- 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 Sameer Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 22/0669, dated 3 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is the reduction of an existing dormer and part two storey side and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council has confirmed that Policy DMP1 of the Development Management Policies has been superseded by Policy DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan (LP) adopted in February 2022.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

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The proposed development includes a 2-storey side extension to a semi-detached dwelling sited on the footprint of an existing single storey addition. The appeal scheme also includes a single storey rear extension and an increase in the depth of the 2-storey outrigger. During the site visit it was observed that other dwellings within the surrounding primarily residential area had been altered including side, rear and roof extensions. However, from the public viewpoints available, it was not possible to see all the alterations to these dwellings and the effect on their context.
5. An objection has been raised by the Council to the lack of a sufficient set-back for the proposed side extension's front elevation. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document 2 *Residential Extensions and Alterations* (SPD2) includes guidance that a first floor side extension should be set back by 2.5 metres from the main front wall of the house. SPD2 guidance refers to the purpose of the

- set-back as being to ensure that an extension is suitably subservient to the main house and to prevent the creation of a terracing effect between buildings.
6. At first floor level the front elevation of the proposed side extension would be set back about 2.5 metres from the host property's 2-storey front projection which includes a bay window. Within the streetscene, even with the erection of the proposed side extension the 2-storey front projection would remain the visually and physically dominant element of the enlarged property's front elevation. The proposed side extension would appear suitably subservient in scale and appearance to the host property and would not result in any unacceptable terracing effect.
 7. The purpose of the guidance in SPD2 concerning the need for a set-back would be met and there would not be unacceptable harm caused to the character and appearance of the residential streetscene along Blackstone Road. There would remain a pattern of pairs of 2-storey semi-detached dwellings sited to the rear of front gardens either landscaped or used for parking.
 8. From the property's garden, the rear elevations of the dwellings fronting Blackstone Road possess a distinctive form with 2-storey outriggers projecting into the gardens. To the side of the outriggers are single storey side additions which generally extend further into the gardens. The proposed development would increase the depth of the property's outrigger but this increase in size would not materially disrupt the contribution made by the property to the rhythm and character of the rear elevations of the surrounding dwellings.
 9. However, the 2-storey side extension would project into the rear garden and would be longer than the enlarged outrigger. The design, siting and scale of this element of the appeal scheme would fail to respect the form of the host property and this pair of semi-detached dwellings. By failing to complement the form of the host and surrounding dwellings, significant harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the surrounding area which would be accentuated by the overall scale of the alterations to the rear of the property, including the proposed single storey extension. The reduction in the width of the existing roof dormer would not mitigate this unacceptable harm.
 10. The appellant has referenced other schemes in the local area where alterations have been undertaken to dwellings. However, although those dwellings along Blackstone Road were viewed from the road, there was no opportunity to inspect the rear elevations of these other schemes and establish their contribution to the character and appearance of their surroundings. Accordingly, the proposed development has been assessed on its own circumstances.
 11. Although there would be no material harm to the streetscene, because of the cumulative effect of the alterations at the rear of the property it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It is further concluded that the appeal scheme 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