

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25<sup>th</sup> November 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/25/3371201**

**8A Newton Road, Brent, London, NW2 6PR**

- 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 S. Bardhoshi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
  - The application Ref is 25/1600.
  - The development proposed is retention of first floor rear conservatory.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the development in the banner heading above was taken from the planning application form, with the omission of the word 'retrospective' as this is not an act of development.
3. I noted while on my site visit that the development is complete. The Council state that the submitted plans do not accurately reflect the appeal scheme. My assessment is made against the plans before me. These plans form the basis for the planning application in any event.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

5. The appeal property is a first floor flat within a red brick terrace of two storey dwellings. To the front the terrace is relatively unaltered and have attractive double height bays. To the rear the dwellings have two-storey, paired rear outriggers with pitched roofs. Despite an existing boundary wall on Temple Road, the layout of development in the area is such that the rear elevations of part of the terrace are clearly visible from the public realm, and the rear outriggers result in a consistent rhythm of development, which contributes to a pleasing uniformity that has a positive impact on the established street scene.
6. The appeal scheme is a white UPVC conservatory extension at first floor level, above a single storey flat roofed extension, which is part of the flat below. The lightweight structure has a flat roof and while this keeps its height to a minimum it does not reflect the established built form in the area which, particularly at first floor level and above, is characterised by pitched roofs,

7. In a previous appeal at the host property for the erection of a dormer<sup>1</sup> the Inspector stated that 'the rear of the appeal property contributes to the cohesive quality of the row of out-ridgers, despite being altered by way of a first floor white-framed glazed extension. The end gables with dual pitched roofs, is the dominant feature in this part of the street scene'. The appeal scheme was not included as part of the proposed development. As such, their comments in relation to the first floor conservatory are part of a general description of the established built form in the area. As their assessment is not specifically based on the impact of the extension on character and appearance it is of limited weight in my assessment of the scheme before me.
8. The appellant has suggested that the external materials of the extension could be controlled by condition. However, this would not overcome my concerns in regard to the overall design and form of the development. While it is acknowledged that conservatory extensions often do not reflect the host property in terms of external materials, in most instances they are erected at ground level where they are usually screened from wider views.
9. In this instance the conservatory extension occupies a prominent elevated position, which is clearly visible from the street. Its prominence is further exacerbated due to its external materials, design and built form which are at odds with the traditional paired rear outriggers on the rear elevation of the terrace. This results in the conservatory appearing as an incongruous addition to the rear of the host property.
10. For the reasons detailed above, the appeal scheme has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the immediate area. Therefore, it would conflict with Policy DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 which accepts development provided its materials, detailing and design compliments the locality. The development also fails to accord with the guidance provided within Brents Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (January 2025), which states that generally the appearance and building materials of extensions should match that of the original home.

### **Other Matters**

11. My attention has been drawn to similar developments on the rear elevation of properties on Mora Road. I do not have full details of the background to these examples. However, they serve to confirm the harm that alterations of inappropriate design and materials can have. In light of this, they do not justify allowing further harm to be caused. In any event I have determined the appeal on its own individual planning merits.
12. The Church of St Michael is nearby and is a grade II listed building. Its significance is derived in part from its age, architectural design and contribution to the street scene. Its setting and significance are unaffected given the small scale of development, distance between the two, and lack of intervisibility.

### **Conclusion**

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

*C Livingstone* INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> APP/T5150/W/24/3354250