



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2025

by **S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/25/3371238

215 Church Road, London NW10 9EP

- 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 Osama Al-Wakil, Frontward Ltd, against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 24/3691.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension to the rear of the outrigger and conversion of the outrigger ground floor area into a self-contained studio flat (1 bed 1 person) and the erection of a cycle store to the rear of the garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the vitality and viability of the Church End Town Centre.

Reasons

3. The appeal property forms part of a 3-storey terrace with large 3-storey outriggers to the rear. There are a pair of flats on the upper floors with a street level entrance at the front of the property. At the time of my visit a portion of the ground floor immediately next to the street, with a floor area of approximately 20sqm, was in use for retail purposes and the rear part was a vacant shell. The information before me indicates that the rear part previously comprised an unauthorised flat and the appellant has advised that this space has not been used for commercial purposes for many years. There is however no firm evidence before me to demonstrate that the lawful use of the ground floor of the appeal premises, excluding the entrance hall to the flats above, is anything other than Use Class E, Commercial.
4. The property is within the Church End Town Centre and forms part of a parade of shops that is defined in the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 (2022) (LP) as a secondary shopping frontage.
5. The proposal would comprise the erect of a small extension to the rear of the outrigger and the conversion of the ground floor space within the outrigger into a small 1-bedroom, 1-person flat with access gained via a corridor from the residential entrance serving the upper level flats. A commercial unit would be

retained within the front portion of the ground floor. The proposal would significantly reduce the floorspace available for commercial uses.

6. LP Policy BE4 states that “*unviable secondary frontage, as shown on the policies map, on the periphery of town centres will be promoted for workspace, social infrastructure and residential uses*” and viability will be determined in accordance with the marketing requirements set out in the LP. The appeal premises form part of a long parade of ground floor retail and town centre uses and there are further such uses on the opposite side of the road. As such I am not of the view that the property is located on the periphery of the Church End Town Centre, and it is questionable whether the section LP Policy BE4 quoted above is applicable to the appeal proposal.
7. Notwithstanding the above there is negligible evidence before me to demonstrate that the ground floor of the appeal property is unviable for commercial purposes in its lawful form, particularly given the fact the Use Class E allows for a wide range of commercial uses to occur, not just retail. The proposal would result in a very small commercial unit that would no longer be capable of catering for E Class uses such as restaurants, dental surgeries and health facilities. In addition, the space would be unattractive to many retailers who would require secondary space for storage and staff facilities. Whilst I note there may currently be demand for very small commercial units in this area, the loss of capacity to accommodate a wide range of commercial use would be deleterious to the long term protection of the Town Centre.
8. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the vitality and viability of the Church End Town Centre. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims of LP Policy BE4.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR