
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2025

by K Dryden BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/25/3372828

27 Burnley Road, London NW10 1EE

- 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 Bilal Aljarad of Brothers Home Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 25/1800.
 - The development proposed is double storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal has been assessed on the basis that the property is in use as a dwellinghouse. It was noted on my site visit that the front entrance door included doorbells with several flats listed at the property. Additionally, construction of a single storey rear extension has commenced to the rear of the property. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal based on the submitted plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Number 27 Burnley Road is located within a predominantly residential area, characterised by inter-war semi-detached and terraced properties mostly with hipped roofs and wide casement windows. The properties are set back from the road with enclosed front garden areas with many converted for off street parking.
5. The semi-detached, gable end property is prominently sited at the end of Burnley Road, adjacent to a three storey corner property with commercial use at ground floor and residential above. The appeal site is unusual within the local area due to the significant size and shape of the plot, which splays towards the rear of the site on the boundary with the neighbouring corner property. The dwelling has previously been extended with a rear dormer roof extension. The front, side and rear of the site is entirely comprised of hard standing and an outbuilding is sited within the rear corner of the plot along the site boundary.
6. The proposed development would extend the property by way of a two storey side extension with integral garage. The extension would be set down from the main roof ridge line and set back by 0.5m from the front elevation of the property. To the

side, the extension would be set at an unusual angle to the dwelling, utilising the angle of the boundary wall with the neighbouring property and splaying out towards the rear of the plot. The scale and design of the side extension where development is extended to the angled plot boundary would not be a sympathetic design to the rest of the house. Furthermore, the substantial width of the extension at the rear would be greater than the width of the host property and as a result would not appear as a subservient addition.

7. The proposed two storey side extension would clearly be visible from a range of viewpoints along Burnley Road. The substantial scale and incongruous design of the extension would appear out of place within this setting, harming the character and appearance of the host property, the symmetry with the adjoining semi-detached dwelling and the wider area.
8. A rear single storey addition is proposed spanning the full width of the extended building, more than double that of the existing dwelling. Given the proposed dimensions, the rear addition would not appear subservient to the host building or the local pattern of development.
9. Both parties have referred to the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD), 2025. The SPD recognises the impact residential extensions have on the character of an area and seeks to amplify the development plan policies, encouraging sensitive and sympathetic design. Among other requirements, proposals for two storey side extensions should be no more than two thirds of the width of the original dwelling and single storey rear extensions up to the full width of the original dwelling. For the reasons outlined above, I find that the development does not accord with a number of the SPD's general principles, including the excessive width of the residential extensions.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. This is contrary to Policy DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 which seeks to ensure that new development complements the locality and is of an appropriate scale, design and siting.

Other Matters

11. My attention has been drawn to a number of examples in the wider area where dwellinghouse extensions have been approved. The addresses provided are sited a significant distance from the appeal property, do not have the same site context and are not recent decisions. Accordingly, these examples are of limited weight in my decision.
12. I acknowledge that the proposed development would provide enhanced living space for the occupants of the property. However, this consideration does not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and the material considerations, do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Accordingly, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Dryden

INSPECTOR