
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2025 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/25/3372538

208 Watford Road, Harrow, Brent HA1 3TY

- 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 Wali Fayzan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 25/1563.
 - The development proposed is the “retention of works including demolition of garage and rear bay windows, replacement of mock tudor front façade with brick-effect cladding to first floor front bay window, erection of front extension, two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, and loft conversion to include rear dormer, x1 front and x2 side rooflights to dwellinghouse”.
-

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 on the application form leaves some key elements of the proposal out. Whilst the decision notice is different, the description thereon is used by the appellant in both the appeal form and their statement. There was no agreement to a change; however, the description on the decision notice more accurately describes the development. I have referred to it above and, for the reasons I have set out, it would not prejudice either main party in making their respective cases.
4. The Council has substantive concerns about the accuracy of the plans vs what has been applied for and subsequently built on site. The appellant acknowledges such and suggests they could be amended post decision should the appeal be allowed. Notwithstanding, and to clarify, I have considered the appeal on the basis of the plans referred to on the decision notice. The main issues in which are the effect of the proposal on a) the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 210 Watford Road (No 210) and b) the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Living Conditions

4. The appeal dwelling has been significantly extended; however, it is the rear extension that's the subject of concern in terms of living conditions. It creates the

new boundary between the two properties and as a result it would present as a sheer blank elevation which would further enclose the garden space and result in an unacceptably poor outlook when using it. Whilst there is a small outbuilding sitting along this boundary, the increased height and depth of the extension along with the track path of the sun would result in a large proportion of the garden, including the immediate patio area, to be shaded. In addition, and whilst there are some differences in land levels which have been agreed by the main parties, this would exacerbate the negative views experienced down the length of one side of the garden and the primarily usable space of the garden for sitting out.

5. The scale and placement of the extension would also unacceptably compromise the outlook and light into the ground floor window to No 210 sited nearest it with the above in mind. The fact this window serves a kitchen does not mean expectations for such should be lesser.
6. The Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) may suggest larger extensions are acceptable, in terms of depth. Be this as it may, this is not what is being considered. What may be seen as modest in depth and height in some locations, in this circumstance it would have a substantial impact on the neighbouring occupiers in the above terms. With this and the above in mind, the appeal scheme would harmfully affect the outlook and light for the occupiers of No 210. Resultantly, this element of the appeal would conflict with Policy DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 (LP) and the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2025. Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that the living conditions of occupiers of properties are protected.

Character and Appearance

7. The appeal building is situated within a row of large, detached dwellings of varying architectural styling some of which have been significantly extended. The appeal building has been previously extended as part of a previous permission to which this scheme seeks to regularise some of the works not built in accordance therewith. The Council, in regard to each individual element, has not raised any substantive concerns in terms of their impact on the character and appearance of the building or the area. Having regard to the architectural variance of the street scene and the degree of change between what appears to have been approved by the Council previously and what is being applied for here, I do not see a situation where one could convincingly argue that it would be the source of harm in regard to this main issue.
8. I am satisfied therefore that the appeal scheme would be sympathetic to the evolved nature of the dwelling itself and the area, such that it would not harm its character and appearance. The proposal would thus comply with Policy DMP1 of the LP and the guidance within the SPD which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.

Other Matters

9. The National Planning Policy Framework places emphasis on sustainable development and the appellant has sought to effectively reuse previously developed land. However, I have been given no reason to suggest the building's current residential use is at risk without the proposal and even if the scheme does take place on previously developed land, it would be the source of other planning harm in so being. My findings are therefore unchanged.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. I have found in the appellant's favour on the second main issue but this and other areas where the appeal scheme would be acceptable would be a lack of harm which would be neutral in any balance. There would be harm and subsequent development plan conflict arising out of the first main issue. There are no compelling reasons, taking into account other material considerations advanced, to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

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