
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2025 by L Clark MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/25/3365251

4 Copland Close, Wembley, Brent HA0 2EW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO)
 - The appeal is made by Mr. Jagjivan Master against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 25/0505.
 - The development proposed is described as 'construction of one additional storey to the dwelling.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. The description above is taken from the application form and varies slightly from the decision notice. This has not changed anything fundamental nor prejudiced the ability of any party to make their case in respect of the appeal scheme.
4. The appeal relates to the construction of an additional storey to the existing two storey dwelling proposed under the GPDO. There is no evidence before me to dispute that the proposal would comply with the description of permitted development set out in Class AA and therefore the crux of the matter is whether prior approval should be granted or not.
5. Paragraph AA.2.(3)(a)(ii) states that prior approval must be applied for as to the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, including the design and architectural features of (aa) the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, and (bb) any side elevation of the dwellinghouse that fronts a highway. This forms the main issue of the appeal.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site is a semi-detached property situated on a small residential cul-de-sac. Most of the properties on Copland Close are two storey and there is a striking sense of symmetry between the appeal property and the adjoining dwelling. The symmetry includes notable features of hipped ends and triangular rooflines over the

projecting bay windows and is also repeated across numbers 2-3 Copland Close which gives a pleasant consistency to the street scene. The appeal property is visible from Crawford Avenue which is also predominantly made up of similar groups of two-storey semi-detached properties.

7. The proposal would unbalance the symmetry of the dwellings by introducing a third storey that would awkwardly tower over the surrounding development in the middle of the group. It would be dominant within the street scene and from Crawford Avenue. The third storey would create an alien feature that would negatively draw the eye and interrupt the consistency between the properties. The proposal would therefore cause harm to the design and architectural features of the principal elevation of the building contrary to the prior approval requirements of the aforementioned section of the GPDO.

Other Matters

8. It may be the case that the appearance would be more balanced if the appeal related to both 4 & 5 Copland Close but that is not the scheme before me. I am aware of a similar scheme under consideration for No 5 but there is no suitably robust mechanism before me to ensure that both would be built out. There is further no guarantee that nearby schemes will be carried out. The lack of any neighbour objection in this case would be a neutral matter which would be incapable of weighing in favour of the proposal even in the event such could be considered within the scope of this prior approval process, for the purposes of this main issue.
9. I agree that visual uniformity is not a sole consideration in the prior approval process, but design and architectural features can contribute to uniformity, and it can therefore form part of the consideration. I have had regard to the other examples but assessment under the GPDO for the purposes of this main issue and the specific context of the appeal site means they do not change my findings.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, the proposal would not satisfy an assessment under prior approval for the above purposes. I therefore recommend the appeal is dismissed.

L Clark

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR