



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2023

by A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/22/3311096

51 Salmon Street Brent LONDON NW9 8PP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Miss Simons against the decision of Brent Council.
 - The application Ref 22/2588, dated 20 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is Erection of a part single and part first floor rear extension, new roof and alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appellant has pointed to the grant of planning permission at the site with references 22/3975 and 22/3994 subsequent to the refusal of the matter here appealed. At the time of my visit it appeared that works according to these permissions for a roof extension and rear ground floor extension were ongoing but incomplete. I have determined this matter accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. No.51 Salmon Street (No.51) is a large extended detached house in a group of three broadly similar prominently positioned mid-twentieth-century houses which overlook a wide section of Salmon Street. No.49 Salmon Street, which sits adjacent to the appeal site, is a smaller dwelling with accommodation within the roof space over a ground floor.
5. At the time of my visit the lower roof of this neighbouring dwelling allowed approach views of the emerging roof structure of No.51¹ and would similarly allow views of the proposed much deeper roof structure. Prior to these recent changes however, No.51 was unobtrusive in the street scene having comfortably accommodated minor changes to its appearance.

¹ It is presumed the works being those referred to in the preliminary paragraph

6. The appellant refers to a number of examples of alterations and suggests the proposal would 'aesthetically improve the haphazard roof form'. To my mind assessment of the effect of changes would be based upon an understanding of the original design approach and the effect of subsequent changes apparent in the subject building. No.51 has been altered in many respects but originally, like its neighbours², appears to have been a derivative mid-twentieth century typology of housing. Influenced largely by the 'arts and crafts' movement of the late nineteenth century, the dominant characteristic of this typology would be the form of its plain-tiled roof, typically with gabled wings, prominent brick flues and dormers, hipped roof surfaces and eaves overhang. These features would tend to reduce visual bulk and apparent scale but are now only nominally present in the host building due to alterations.
7. The proposal would add a 2 metre deep upper floor extension to an existing 3 metre deep flat-roofed rear extension of earlier origin. Whilst the flat-roofed extension (for which no planning history is advanced) is not a positive feature of the existing building it is located to the rear and has no impact upon the street scene. Notwithstanding the permissions granted, the proposal would add a 2 metre deep first floor extension to a rectangular floor plan which is unrelieved by any articulation of the interior layout that buildings of this typology would usually present. The associated rearward extension of the high roof, including over the existing flat roof area would tend to emphasise the unbroken expanse of tiled surface on the visible flank elevations and draw attention to the uncharacteristic depth and scale of the additions proposed, particularly in view from the street where visible over the relatively low built form of No.49.
8. Whilst No.51 is already much altered and extended (including the recent removal of prominent chimneys which made a positive contribution to the overall appearance) what is proposed would be a significant increment of further change in which regard the cumulative impact upon the dwelling would (as my reasoning sets out) be contrary to principles of good design, to the detriment the character and appearance of the locality.
9. I therefore conclude, for the reasons given and taking all matters raised into account, that the proposal would not accord with Policies DMP1(a) and BD1 of the Brent Local Plan (2022) which seek high standards of design, detailing and appropriate scale in order to provide high levels of amenity and complement the locality, and, being in conflict with the development plan as a whole, that the appeal cannot succeed.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR

² Specifically No.53 and No.55