



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2025

by **D Cleary MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/25/3360813

83 Tadworth Road, London NW2 7UB

- 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 Ghulam Farid against the decision of the London Borough of Brent Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/3133.
 - The development proposed is described as the demolition of rear store extension, construction of ground floor rear extension and first floor rear extension with alteration of first floor rear window to dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of rear store extension, construction of ground floor rear extension and first floor rear extension, with alteration of first floor rear window to dwellinghouse at 83 Tadworth Road, London NW2 7UB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/3133, and subject to the following conditions:

1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans referenced:

TP/508/R01 - LOCATION AND EXISTING PROPOSED SITE PLANS

TP/508/R02 - EXISTING FLOOR PLANS

TP/508/R03 - EXISTING ELEVATIONS

TP/508/R04 - PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS AND SECTION

TP/508/R05 - PROPOSED ELEVATIONS

TP/508/R06 - PROPOSED BLOCK PLAN

3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the banner above, and in my formal decision, I have referred to the description of development as detailed on the decision notice of the Council, rather than that

which is contained within the application form. This is because it more accurately describes the development.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area; and, the living conditions of existing and future occupants with particular regard to the level of internal living space.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, end-terraced dwelling with hipped roof. The dwelling has bricked elevations at ground floor level, and rendered elevations at first floor level. A part single storey, part two-storey projection is located across the width of the property to the rear. The two-storey element has a hipped roof and is positioned to one side of the elevation, providing a book end to the terrace. The single storey element includes a flat roof. A flat roof box dormer is positioned in the rear roof slope. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character. Numerous properties have single storey extensions to the rear and box dormers within the rear roof slopes.
5. The development proposed includes a single storey rear extension which would project beyond part of the existing rear projections. The Council raise no specific concerns with regard to this element of the scheme. Given its modest scale, siting and design I have no reason to disagree.
6. The proposed first floor rear extension would be partially sited above the existing ground floor projection, and would abut the two-storey rear projection, extending to the rear by a similar distance. The extension would be narrow and would include a flat roof. The flat roof would be of similar height to the first-floor eaves of the dwelling. The proportions of the extension would result in a relatively modest amount of additional bulk to the dwelling. Furthermore, the position of the extension, set against existing two-storey built form, would ensure that it would appear visually well contained. As such, the scale and position of the extension would appear as a relatively discrete and subservient addition to the dwelling itself.
7. The rear siting and modest scale of the extension is such that it would not be prominent from public vantage points, although it would be visible from some nearby neighbouring gardens. The modest scale of the extension, along with its discrete positioning, would mean that the extension would be viewed against the existing built form and, therefore, would not appear overly prominent from neighbouring gardens. Therefore, I find that it would appear as a visually unobtrusive addition to the dwelling.
8. The flat roof design of the extension would not reflect the hipped roof of the existing property. I accept that, generally, two-storey flat roof extensions can appear as incongruous additions. Nonetheless, to some extent, the incorporation of a flat roof would visually reflect the roof design of the single storey rear projection and the box dormer. Importantly, in this instance, the modest scale of the extension, in a discrete and visually contained position, would ensure that it would not appear as

an overly incongruous addition that would visually detract from the character and appearance of the building.

9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing building or surrounding area. Therefore, the development complies with Policy DMP1 of the London Borough of Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 (2022) (the BLP). This confirms that development will be acceptable providing it is of a siting, layout, scale and design which complements the locality.
10. I acknowledge that the development would not adhere to the guidance contained within the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD2 (2018) with respect to its roof design. However, I am mindful that this is guidance only and, for the reasons that I have identified, I find that the roof of this particular extension would not be harmful.

Living Conditions

11. The scheme includes the creation of a bedroom which I understand would fall below the minimal internal room size as set out in Policy D6¹ of the London Plan (2021) (the LP). While I note the concern of the Council in this regard, the works to provide this bedroom are provided within the fabric of the existing dwelling. Such internal works, as proposed, appear unlikely to fall within the definition of development as defined by the Act² and, therefore, would not require planning permission.
12. In any event, the concerns relate to a single room within an existing dwelling. When considering the level of accommodation provided within the dwelling as a whole, I am not persuaded that the proposals would result in a substandard internal environment that would amount to a harmful effect on living conditions.
13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of existing or future occupants of the dwelling by reason of the internal living space. Therefore, the development complies with Policy DMP1 of the BLP and D6 of the LP. Together, amongst other things, these seek to deliver development which provides high quality internal living environments.

Conditions

14. I have imposed standard conditions relating to the commencement of development, and to require compliance with the submitted plans for certainty. I have suggested that materials match those used on the existing building, which is necessary in the interest of the character and appearance of the building and area.

Conclusions

15. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR

¹ D6 F3)

² S.55(2)(a)(i)