



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2023

by E Dade BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/22/3304439

517 North Circular Road, London NW2 7QG

- 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 Jamil Hussain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 22/1479, dated 19 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of a part single, part two storey side extension and conversion into 1 bedroom dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effects of the proposed development on:
 - Whether the existing dwelling is suitable for conversion, in particular whether the proposal would result in the loss of a larger dwelling and whether the site is in an accessible location;
 - The character and appearance of the appeal property; and
 - Whether the proposal would provide adequate living conditions for future occupants, with particular regard to internal floor area.

Reasons

Housing stock and location

3. The proposal would involve extension works, conversion of a storage room, subdivision of the garden, and loss of an off-street parking space to accommodate an additional one-bedroom unit on the appeal site. Whilst the proposal would reduce the overall scale of the existing dwelling through conversion of the storage room and reduced curtilage, the existing three-bedroom dwelling would be retained. The proposal would not therefore result in the loss of a larger family-sized home.
4. However, the appeal site is located in PTAL zone 2. Through formation of a one-bedroom unit, the proposal would intensify the use of the site in an area of poor public transport accessibility. The appeal site is around nine minutes' walk to Neasden town centre, and therefore is not within close walking distance of town centre services. The proposal would include cycle storage which could

support a reduction in car journeys. However, due to the site's poor access to public transport, this would not wholly mitigate the site's car dependency.

5. The development therefore is not in an acceptably accessible location to be suitable for conversion. The proposed development would therefore conflict with policies BH4 and BH11 of the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 (2022) (BLP) which together prioritise the retention of family size housing, supporting the conversion of such dwellings only where certain criteria are met, including that the dwelling is situated within an area with good public transport accessibility.
6. Whilst the Highway Authority were consulted on the proposal and did not raise objections, I have found the site's location conflicts with policies of the Development Plan.

Character and appearance

7. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling with a distinctive roof form, consisting of a hipped roof over the front projection and a prominent catslide roof at the main part of the dwelling. This roof form is reflected on the adjoining property, giving the pair of semi-detached dwellings a symmetrical appearance.
8. The proposed first-floor extension would seek to replicate the vernacular of the host dwelling through extending the catslide roof plane. Whilst the overall dimensions of the proposed first-floor extension would fall within parameters set out in the Residential Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2 (2018) (SPD2), the design of the scheme would add considerable bulk and mass to the roof plane resulting in the first-floor extension appearing of excessive width. This would appear unsympathetic to the form of the appeal property and disproportionate in scale in the context of the semi-detached pair. Due to its corner plot location, the proposal would be especially prominent from the front at the North Circular Road and rear at Aboyne Road.
9. The proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the appeal property. The proposal would not comply with BLP Policy DMP1 which requires proposals to be of a scale and design that complements the locality, and BLP Policy BD1 which requires new development to be of the highest architectural and urban design quality. In addition, the proposal would not satisfy the guidance contained within SPD2 which requires alterations to roofs to be designed to complement the dwelling and the original street character.

Living conditions

10. Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021 sets out minimum floor area standards for dwellings. The London Plan makes clear that the standards apply to all new self-contained dwellings¹. The existing three-bedroom dwelling would be retained, and the internal layout of habitable rooms would be unaltered by the development. I therefore consider that the three-bedroom dwelling would not constitute a new self-contained dwelling and as such Policy D6's space standards do not apply. It is not disputed that the new dwelling would meet the requirements of Policy D6.
11. The proposal would therefore provide adequate internal floor area and so would comply with London Plan Policy D6 which requires housing development to be

¹ Paragraph 3.6.2

of high-quality design and provide adequately sized rooms and BLP Policy DMP1 which requires proposals to be of a layout and design that provides high levels of internal amenity.

Conclusion

12. Although the proposal would provide adequate internal floor area, for the reasons given above, having assessed the case against the development plan as a whole and having had regard to all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Dade

INSPECTOR