



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 January 2024

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/23/3322065

11 Coverdale Road London NW2 4DB

- 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 Mohsen Moosavi against the decision of The London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref: 22/3572 dated 17 October 2022 was refused by notice dated 24 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is Part first floor front/side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development appearing on the refusal notice and application form states 'Part first floor front/side extension'; and the refusal notice is similar. Whilst the proposal would add accommodation it appears to me that since what is proposed would add to the front face of an existing side extension but still sit behind the existing principal frontage line, the extension is more correctly described as a side extension. In addition, the appellant has submitted a proposed minor amendment to the design, being a reduction in the size of an existing side dormer to avoid a clash with the proposed side extension. No rights of any party would be harmed by considering this amendment. I have therefore determined the matter accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the dwelling and of the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal site (No. 11) is a large semi-detached dwelling in a wide suburban street which, in the vicinity of No.11, is populated by a variety of dwelling types including three-storey apartment blocks both opposite and what has been recently constructed immediately to the south of No.9 and 11 Coverdale Road, up to the junction with Willesden Lane. Although No.11 is attached to its neighbour, any mirroring or design symmetry is entirely absent, No.9 is visually dominant, being larger, set at a higher level and with a prominent front projecting gable.
5. The proposal intends to add a small amount of accommodation at first floor level to the front of an existing side extension, retaining a setback from the

principal front elevation. No.11 is substantially enlarged and altered from what would appear to have been its original form such that the elevations which present to the street scene appear as a somewhat visually incoherent assembly of architectural elements. The most prominent of these being the ground floor single-storey garage in contrasting buff brick and its roof terrace, upon which the proposal would be placed.

6. Against that assessment, and noting that the Council accept that the proposal would cause no adverse impacts to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, it is difficult to conclude that what is proposed would cause any further visual harm than that which has already occurred, particularly having regard to the submitted adjustment¹ which would reduce the likely clash with the existing side dormer.
7. However, as the Council point out, the submitted drawings do not properly represent the existing roof form over the extension, nor, therefore, do the drawings of the proposal adequately explain how the proposed additional roof form would attach itself to the main roof.
8. The line drawings provided (proposed roof plan) appear to indicate that the roof to the side extension is either at a lower level to the main roof such that the roof closes to the flank wall of the main house (which it does not) or that the extension, including the roof of the extension as existing, would not intersect with the sloping surfaces of the main roof, which they currently do. Even though it seems that is not intended, I have nothing before me that conclusively shows what roof form would result from the proposal such that a determination of the resulting visual impact on the character and form of the dwelling can be made.
9. Consequently, even if I were to conclude the proposal was acceptable in planning terms, the necessary plans condition would be unenforceable and since such conditions would be integral to reasoning on the main issues identified, the appeal cannot succeed.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR

¹ Drawings 2022/09/03A and 2022/09/04A