



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2022

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/22/3303836

46 Dimsdale Drive, London NW9 8HT

- 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 Carl Farrell against the decision of London Borough of Brent Council.
 - The application Ref 22/0652, dated 22 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 May 2022.
 - The proposal is for part demolition of existing side extension, erection of single storey front to side extension, hip to gable loft extension, first floor side to rear extension and one rooflight to dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice and differs from that used on the Appellant's original application. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development is the same as that used by the Council and as such I have used this description accordingly which I feel accurately represents the scope of the proposals.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the impact of the scheme upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end terrace house within this relatively tight knit suburban area that primarily consists of bow fronted hipped roof terrace houses. The appeal property and its neighbours create a relatively symmetrical row of four properties each having double height bow windows, hipped roofs and front gables paired along the front of the terrace. There is an existing gated grassed driveway running to its side past an existing single storey, flat roof, side extension. To the rear a reasonably sized garden is accessed onto by an existing single storey rear extension and a mature tree provides a valuable natural landscape feature.

5. The proposal before me seeks permission to realign the existing front single storey extension and build atop this existing extension with a first floor gable extension. The proposal would also include a front porch feature that would extend out farther than the existing bow window at the front and accommodate a pitched, lean to, roof.
6. I have evidence before me that the property has applied for a Lawful Certificate of Development to convert the existing hipped roof to that of a gable. This was subsequently confirmed by the Council under application reference 22/0651.
7. In assessing this appeal I am aware of the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Guide (SPD2) that seeks to ensure high quality design. Part of this guidance specifically refers to the need for extensions to be subservient to the original property and no wider than two thirds of the width of the property. There is a suggested set back from the front elevation of 2.5metres for first floor extensions. I am also aware that much of this guidance is concerned with the reduction in harmful terracing effects, presumably where this occurs within areas of semi detached properties.
8. In this case however, although the streetscene is uniform and has the physical appearance of a typical semi detached area, the properties are already terraced and these groups of four terraces are part of the area's character. Therefore, I see little benefit in such a substantial set back to reduce such a terrace effect occurring. However, I do see merit in such a set back in order to distinguish between the extension and the principal building which I consider would still be important.
9. The proposal before me has only provided a set back of the front first floor elevation of around 200mm which fails to offer much, if any, sense of noticeable subservience within the streetscene. Despite the set down to the ridge the proposed first floor front element of the extension would still appear at odds with the general character of the streetscene and the defined rows of four groups of houses within a terrace.
10. In terms of the front porch I saw on my site visit that although there are porch extensions of several kinds, the vast majority appear modest and subservient to the defining character and rhythm of the street that is defined by protruding bow windows, hipped roofs and gabled elevations. Through creating such a large porch therefore the dominance of the existing bow windows to the appeal property would be compromised and the porch extension would encroach upon what is currently a well defined and attractive frontage.
11. As such, although I see there is scope to provide a significant and attractive extension to this property, the scheme before me ultimately fails in its attempt to respond well to the overall character and appearance of the streetscene. As such I find harm to the character of the area through this proposal and consider that it would be contrary to Policies DMP1 and BD1 of Brent's Local Plan as well as guidance provided within the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations design guidance, SPD2.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons above, taking into account all other matters raised I dismiss the appeal

A Graham

INSPECTOR