



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 August 2023

by S Pearce BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/22/3310098

21-23 Alverstone Road, Wembley HA9 9SD

- 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 Vishrut Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 22/0955, dated 25 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as the “demolition of garages and erection of two storey side extensions and porches with hipped roofs, two storey rear extensions, increasing the pitch angle, hip to gables and crown roofs to main roof and loft conversions with 2 rear dormer windows and 6 front rooflights to dwellinghouses, new vehicle access to 23 and associated landscaping”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and host properties.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a pair of semi-detached, two storey properties, 21 and 23 Alverstone Road, sited in a relatively wide and prominent corner plot. Nos 21 and 23 are largely uniform in design, with hipped roofs and prominent two storey, central bay windows.
4. Alverstone Road is characterised by predominantly two storey, semi-detached properties, with a mix of hipped and gable roofs, some with single or two storey side extensions. While some properties have been extended, the subservient nature of these extensions have generally respected the modest proportions of properties in the area. The uniformity in massing, heights and layouts of properties in the street contributes towards the overall character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposal would, among other things, increase the height and pitch of the roofs and introduce rear dormer roof extensions, rear flat roof first floor extensions and a number of crown roofs. The size and design of the extensions, combined with the increased height would dominate the roofline of Nos 21 and 23. Although the appellant contends the proposed crown roofs are modest, they are not a prevent feature within the area, and would still add to the bulk and massing of the proposed extensions. Furthermore, due to the varying heights, massing and styles, the proposed roof forms would appear disjointed.

6. Therefore, the proposed development would cumulatively appear as dominant, incongruous and visually prominent additions at odds with, and to the detriment of, the character and appearance of the area and host properties. Although Nos 21 and 23 are sited in a wide plot, the prominent corner position of the appeal site would further exacerbate this harm.
7. While there are examples of other projecting porches within the area, it is the proposed depth and associated massing of the proposed porches that would detract from the prominent two storey bay windows. This would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area and host properties.
8. The street scene elevations demonstrate that land levels along Alverstone Road fall slightly and, as a result, Nos 21 and 23 sit slightly lower than neighbouring properties, Nos 17 and 19. The appellant contends that the increase in ridge height would be relatively modest. However, the proposed increase would still be sufficient to result in Nos 21 and 23 being higher than Nos 17 and 19. This would further exacerbate the dominance of the proposed development.
9. The appellant has highlighted that the proposed side extensions and dormer windows would appear subordinate to Nos 21 and 23 and follow the guidance within the Brent Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2 2018 (SPD). However, compliance in this respect is not sufficient to overcome the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the area and host properties.
10. Similar developments have been drawn to my attention, including hip to gable extensions. Based on the information submitted, these developments are not directly comparable as they do not feature crown roofs, their overall height has not been increased and they appear generally subservient to the host properties. In any case, I have had regard to this appeal based on its own merits.
11. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area and host properties. As such, it would be contrary to Policies DMP1 and BD1 of the Brent Local Plan Adopted February 2022 and the guidance within the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2 January 2018. Collectively, these seek, among other things, to ensure development complements the locality and delivers high quality design. The proposed development would also conflict with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks, among other things, to ensure development is sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would conflict with the development plan as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate I should conclude other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Pearce

INSPECTOR