
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2025

by **C Livingstone MA(SocSci) (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/25/3367878

6 Egerton Gardens, London NW10 3LD

- 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 Brooke Stephens against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 24/2998.
 - The development proposed is single storey and part two storey wrap around side/rear extension, alterations to front bay.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling within a small cul-de-sac of properties with a similar architectural style. A shared palate of external materials, similar proportions and shared design details gives the built environment in the area a pleasing uniformity. Notwithstanding this, dwellings in the vicinity have been extended, including to the side, rear and roof and this has caused some erosion to the consistency of the established built form.
4. The host property is a well preserved example of the architecture in the area and retains the original double height bay windows on the front and rear elevation. To the rear the dwelling has a large box dormer extension that is reflected in a similar style of extension on the rear elevation of the attached dwelling.
5. Planning permission (ref 24/3706) was recently granted at the appeal property for a development that includes a part-single, part two-storey side-to-rear wrap around extension. The works approved under permission 24/3706 are replicated within the appeal scheme. However, the current proposal also includes a first floor extension on the rear elevation. This extension would have a crown roof that would be connected to both the main roof of the dwelling and the face of the dormer window.
6. Due to the existing large rear dormer, the inclusion of the rear extension would result in a disjointed roof form that would appear as an incongruous addition when considering the rear elevation as a whole. The proposal would therefore result in an unsympathetic and jarring addition to the host property, which would be clearly visible from neighbouring properties.

7. For the reasons detailed above the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Therefore, it would conflict with Policy DMP1 of Brent's Local Plan 2019-2041 (adopted 2022) which requires that development includes detailing and a design that compliments the locality. The proposal would also not adhere to the advice of the Brent's Supplementary Planning Document 2: Residential Extensions and Alterations (adopted 2025), which amongst other matters highlights that it is often not possible to erect a two storey rear extension where there is an existing rear dormer as it can result in an unacceptable design.

Other Matters

8. An appeal was recently granted for the extension of neighbouring property 4 Egerton Gardens¹. However, in that instance the appeal scheme did not include a first floor rear extension and as such does not reflect the proposed scheme in this regard.
9. The appellant asserts that similar developments have been approved in the area including at 2 and 12 Irwin Gardens and 100 Leighton Gardens. However, full details of these permissions have not been provided and as such I cannot be certain that the circumstances in these instances are the same as the scheme before me.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Livingstone

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/T5150/D/20/3258130