



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2022

by K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/21/3289838

250A High Road, London NW10 2NX

- 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 Wenger Investments Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 21/2484, dated 30 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is Completion of 2 self-contained flats under planning permission on first and second floors and roof extension to form 1 self-contained flat and associated internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Completion of 2 self-contained flats under planning permission on first and second floors and roof extension to form 1 self-contained flat and associated internal alterations at 250A High Road, London NW10 2NX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/2484, dated 30 June 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: 120201-00-P0; 120201-01-P0; and 120201-03-P0.
 - 3) The occupation of Flat 03 hereby permitted, as depicted upon approved drawing no.120201-03-P0, shall not commence until internal alterations to establish Flats 01 and 02, in accordance with the proposed first and second floor details shown on approved drawing no. 120201-03-P0, have been completed.
 - 4) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on approved drawing no. 120201-03-P0 and listed at section 14 of the application form.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal property is comprised of an access and entrance corridor at ground floor as well as the first and second floors above. I have used the site address as it appears on the appeal form as opposed to on the application form. This is because any specific reference to Flat 1 does not reflect the five flats I understand to exist presently across the upper floors.

3. The Council has confirmed the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 (the Local Plan) was adopted in February 2022, such that its policies now attract full weight. The main parties have had the opportunity to comment upon any relevance of this to the outcome of the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property is positioned within a terraced row and in a vibrant mixed-use location. Whilst this row of buildings is of a largely consistent three-storey height and flat-roofed composition close to the site, properties vary in terms of their detailing and external-facing materials. An example of this is an adjacent characterful corner building, which provides a strong end focal point to the row. The wider built environment provides greater variety, including additional storey and differing and/or amended roof forms.
6. The roof extension that is proposed would utilise matching materials, well aligned fenestration and be set back behind the main front building line and a short parapet. This arrangement would moderate the roof extension's visual prominence and would promote that it appears as a subordinate addition to the building, even though not setback to the rear and not of mansard design.
7. Whilst there is a predominantly uniform height within the section of the terraced row that contains the appeal property, and the proposal would introduce a new element at roof level, the extension would not be experienced as an unduly bulky or wholly unexpected addition. This is in part due to the roof-level variations and mixed character and appearance that already exists locally. The roof extension would to my mind read as an acceptable and suitably unobtrusive variation. In this instance, such incremental development and densification would not significantly alter the character of the street scene and wider area.
8. The proposal would therefore not cause any significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would satisfactorily accord with the provisions of Policy DMP1 of the Local Plan insofar as it is relevant to the appeal proposal and seeks development that complements the locality. The appeal proposal would also fulfil the aims of National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021) (the Framework), where it promotes good design and seeks to ensure that development will function well.

Other Matters

9. The Council has raised no issues regarding the intended reduction of units, due to the improvements which would accrue to the accommodation. Indeed, notwithstanding the absence of external amenity space and cycle parking, which is already a feature of the existing accommodation, the proposal would have positive implications in terms of housing quality and anticipated reduced parking demand. Whilst such improvements could be achieved without adding a roof extension to the property, it remains that the proposal would result in better quality living accommodation when compared to current circumstances. These aspects would fulfil the aims of the London Plan Policy D6 and the

Framework which seek to achieve healthy, inclusive, and safe places. The proposal is consistent with these aims, which weighs in its favour.

10. The proposed development accords with the development plan when considered as a whole, and material considerations do not lead me to a decision otherwise.

Conditions

11. I have imposed conditions that both the Council and the appellant have had the opportunity to comment upon. I have imposed a condition to specify the approved plans as this provides certainty. To promote satisfactory living conditions and to achieve an overall reduction in units as applied for, a condition securing the completion of internal works to establish Flats 1 and 2 prior to Flat 3's occupation is reasonable and necessary to impose. Finally, I have imposed a condition pertaining to materials to ensure the proposed development is built in accordance with the approved details in the interests of safeguarding the appearance of the host building and local area.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed such that planning permission should be granted subject to conditions.

K Williams

INSPECTOR