



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2022

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/22/3306974

3 Norval Road, Wembley, Brent HA0 3TD

- 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 Haydar Al-Rukabi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 22/2033, dated 7 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as the installation of new windows to the front of the premises, and the installation of a new uPVC garage door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of new windows to the front of the premises, and the installation of a new uPVC front door and uPVC garage doors at 3 Norval Road, Wembley, Brent HA0 3TD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/2033, dated 7 June 2022, and with the location plan, and drawing nos SK01 Rev 0 ('Front elevation'), SK02 Rev 0 and SK01 Rev 0 ('Windows and doors elevation').

Preliminary Matters

2. The development the subject of this appeal is already in place. I understand that the works were carried out in 2018, and the appellant therefore believes that it is an 'established use'.
3. Notwithstanding that, I have dealt with the scheme on the basis of the retention of the existing development, and as an appeal under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 following the refusal of planning permission.
4. In its decision and its delegated report, the Council sets out that the uPVC front door and garage doors are incongruous. However, it continues that the porch is acceptable as it is fully glazed, as are the replacement uPVC windows as they are an improvement compared to what was there previously, and match those on the other half of this semi-detached pair. I have no reason to disagree with that assessment, and I have therefore focused on the doors in my decision.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the front door and the garage doors on the character and appearance of the host property and the area, including whether they preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Sudbury Court Conservation Area.

Reasons

6. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that, in respect of development affecting conservation areas, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing their character or appearance. The National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework') sets out that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, such as conservation areas, and that harm to their significance requires clear and convincing justification.
7. Policy BHC1 of the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 (2022) ('BLP') states that proposals shall sustain or enhance the significance of heritage assets, and should contribute to local distinctiveness having regard to matters such as good quality design and appropriate materials.
8. This part of the Sudbury Court Conservation Area ('the SCCA') is broadly characterised by semi-detached pairs of properties, which are set back from the road. To the front they display architectural elements typical of their era, such as dominant two storey bay windows, exposed timbers and ornate tilework. The buildings' form, materials and detailing contribute to the significance of this designated heritage asset.
9. In that context, the Sudbury Court Conservation Area Design Guide 2015 ('DG') sets out that it prefers timber replacement front doors, but that slim section framed uPVC may be acceptable provided that it is in keeping with windows in the front elevation. It continues that as original garage doors make an important contribution to the SCCA's character, their retention will be encouraged, and that where a garage is replaced, new wooden side hung doors should be used.
10. The appellant has provided a survey which seeks to demonstrate that many houses on Norval Road have porches, and that most of those surveyed had either no garage, or had non-timber garage doors. I observed on my visit that there is considerable diversity, including some nearby 'up-and over' metal garage doors, such as next to this site at No 5.
11. Whilst the uPVC garage doors here have a less discrete profile than the few timber garage doors that I observed, as they are side-hung, with small windows, they reflect their general style and, as demonstrated by the appellant's photographic evidence, they have a broadly similar appearance to the ones they replaced.
12. Moreover, their white colour and their materials match the replacement windows, to which the Council does not object. In that context, those garage doors, and the similar style replacement front door, which is partially obscured from public view behind a glazed porch, respect the host property, and they do not stand out as incongruous in the streetscene.
13. Irrespective of the poor condition of the original doors, and the appellant's security concerns, the development has not harmed the host property, and it has preserved the character and appearance of the SCCA. The scheme does not therefore conflict with BLP Policy BHC1 or with the Framework, nor with the general thrust of the DG.
14. In the event that the appeal is allowed, the Council has suggested the standard time limit condition, and conditions requiring the development to be carried out

in accordance with the approved plans and for it to be faced in matching materials. However, as I have found the existing development to be acceptable, none of those are appropriate.

15. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR