



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2025 by M Jones

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/25/3368271

120 Slough Lane, Brent, London, NW9 8XL

- 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 Mohammad Hamza against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 25/0805.
 - The development proposed is described as “Retention of porch”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for porch at 120 Slough Lane, Brent, London, NW9 8XL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/0805, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The external materials of the front and side walls of the porch and the tiles used for the porch roof shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: XEVA/120SL/501 Rev A; XEVA/120SL/503 Rev A; XEVA/120SL/504 Rev A; XEVA/120SL/507 Rev A; PP-13863787v1.

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

3. I saw on site that a porch has been constructed, but there are discrepancies between the drawings submitted and what has been built. The porch as built is wider than shown on the plans, leaving a narrower gap between the side of the porch and the ground floor bay window, and has a steeper roof pitch. Given these differences, the as built development is materially different to the submitted drawings such that the changes could not be resolved through use of planning conditions. Therefore, in the interests of clarity and fairness, I have made my assessment based on submitted plans, as that is what has been applied for.
4. The Council advises that the appeal site is currently subject to two planning enforcement cases; the first relates to the erection of a new boundary treatment, the front porch and the erection of a side extension; and the second relates to an

alleged material change of use of a former garage to a dwelling. The appeal before me only relates to the front porch so I will not be assessing the other elements.

5. In the Decision above I have removed wording from the description that does not refer to acts of development.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. The appeal property is a link-detached dwelling situated in a corner plot in a predominantly residential area. The appeal property forms part of a row of dwellings which are characterised by consistency in their design, form and materials. Some of these properties have had their porches infilled in line with their front bay window but without projecting further out. The appeal property has alterations to the fenestration and has been rendered but otherwise retains a similar design and form to the other dwellings.
8. In the wider local area, the houses are typically semi-detached but with a variety of different designs, sizes and forms and a number of dwellings have been altered through roof, side and porch extensions. Whilst there are a few isolated examples of large porch extensions in the wider local area, most of the front porches near to the appeal property are modest in design and size and do not project beyond the front bay window.
9. The proposed porch would extend significantly outwards from the existing front door which is already in line with the front bay window. It would also be wider than the existing front entrance and significantly taller as a result of the pitched roof. As a result, the proposed porch would result in a bulky and protruding front addition which would be particularly noticeable in the street scene given the appeal property's prominent corner plot siting and the alterations already made to its front elevation.
10. Consequently, the proposed development would not complement the character and proportions of the appeal property and would be out of keeping with the pattern of development in the local area and so would be a discordant addition to the street scene.
11. For these reasons, the front porch would not achieve the high-quality design and regard for local character required by local and national policy and so would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area. The proposed development would not, therefore, comply with Policy DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 (adopted 2022) which requires development to be of a design that complements the locality. The conflict with the development plan is a matter to which I afford substantial weight.
12. It would also not comply with Part 3.8 of the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2025) which requires porches to complement the character and proportions of the original dwelling and states that, in most cases, porches should not extend forward beyond any existing projecting features, including a bay window, unless it is a common feature of an area's character.

13. The proposed development would also not be compatible with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework which aims to deliver high quality design that complements local context and character.
14. Notwithstanding this, the appellant has raised the possibility of constructing a front porch under permitted development rights if the appeal is not allowed. The appellant has not definitively stated that they would do this but the fact it has been raised in their written submissions, and given the ongoing enforcement action by the Council, I consider that there is a greater than theoretical possibility that this development would take place as a fallback.
15. The permitted development parameters for an external porch are set out under Class D of Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (the GPDO). The appellant has stated that the ground area of the proposed porch would not exceed 3 square metres as stipulated in Class D and would only exceed the permitted height limit by 300mm.
16. The appellant has provided no drawings of an alternative front porch that could be built under permitted development rights. Further, it is unclear what the floor area of the proposed porch would be because there is a discrepancy between the figure given on the application form (3.14 square metres) and the figure stated in the appellant's written submissions (2.15 square metres).
17. However, even if I take the larger floor area figure for the appeal proposal, given the parameters set out under Class D, it is evident that a porch built under the fallback option would be broadly similar to the proposed development in terms of size, design and form. A permitted development porch would just be slightly lower in height and may be slightly smaller in area. Given this similarity in size and form, I consider that the alternative porch would cause substantially similar harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and local area as the proposed development would. I therefore give this fallback position great weight, and, in this case, it justifies making a decision which is not in accordance with the development plan.

Conditions

18. I recommend the standard time period for commencement of the development condition in the interests of expediency. I also recommend a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plans as this provides certainty. I further recommend a condition requiring use of matching materials to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development taking into account the character and appearance of the local area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

19. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that, on balance, the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

M Jones

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

20. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning and recommendation. Although the proposed porch would harm the character and appearance of the area and conflict with the development plan, that is outweighed in this case by material considerations, given that the fallback option would result in substantially similar harm to the appeal proposal. On that basis the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions listed above.

L McKay

INSPECTOR