

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 November 2024

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/24/3348588
63 Paxford Road, Wembley, Brent, HA0 3RJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr R and Mrs M Bhalla against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 24/0834.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension and rear infill extension and detached rear outbuilding (following demolition of side detached garage).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Sudbury Court Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a two storey, semi-detached dwelling with a small single storey garage to the side, separated from the dwelling by a narrow gate and side passage to the rear garden.
 4. The appeal property is located within a residential area, where the presence of similar two storey, semi-detached dwellings set back from the road behind short driveways and/or gardens and with longer gardens to the rear, are a common feature. The dwelling is situated within the Sudbury Court Conservation Area, an inter-war Garden Suburb characterised by the presence of mock Tudor detached and semi-detached dwellings set out within a planned residential estate of garden plots along tree-lined roads.
 5. Common design features, including decorative half-timbering, mullioned windows and two storey gables, contribute to an attractive sense of heritage and uniformity. Further, the presence of grass verges and street trees along spacious streets combines with the setting back of dwellings within comfortable garden plots to result in a notably green and spacious environment.
 6. I observed during my site visit that whilst many dwellings in the area have been altered and/or extended, such changes generally appear to be in keeping with
-

the character of the Sudbury Court Conservation Area and to respect the appearance of host dwellings.

7. The appeal dwelling, with its front gable, decorative half-timbering, mullioned windows and modest garage of original appearance presents an attractive front façade to Paxford Road and makes a positive contribution to the Sudbury Court Conservation Area.
8. The proposal would involve the demolition of the garage and the creation of a single storey side extension which would have a lower-pitched roof than that of the existing garage. The existing timber garage door with strap hinges would be replaced by a window and the proposal would not replicate the existing garage's front gabled eaves.
9. Taking the above into account, I find that the proposed side extension would appear as an awkward addition to the dwelling. The low-pitched roof proposed would fail to appear in keeping with the pitch of the roof of the host dwelling and would result in the extension appearing as an unduly squat addition.
10. Further, the proposed replacement of a garage door with a window would result in the single storey extension appearing as an incongruous addition, out of character with the dwelling's original appearance. The harmful impact of this would be exacerbated as a result of the proposed window appearing out of sync with the dwelling's existing ground floor window, due to being a different size and a different style; and being set at a lower height within different surrounding brickwork.
11. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would detract from and would not conserve the appearance of the Sudbury Court Conservation Area. Having regard to paragraph 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and to Planning Practice Guidance, I consider that the harm to the character and appearance of the Sudbury Court Conservation Area would be less than substantial. This needs to be balanced against any public benefits the development may bring.
12. In this regard, there is nothing before me that comprises or amounts to a public benefit that outweighs the harm identified.
13. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the Sudbury Court Conservation Area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, to Policy DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan (2022) and to the Council's Sudbury Court Conservation Area Design Guide (2015), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR