



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2025

by T Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/25/3374386

54 Robson Avenue, Brent, London NW10 3SG

- 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 Mrs T Begum against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 25/0360.
 - The development proposed is part single rear and side extension, loft conversion and creation of two self-contained flats of 2no. of 3 beds for 5 people with associated cycle storage, bin storage, and amenities.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. A partial application for costs is made by Mrs T Begum against the Council of the London Borough of Brent. That application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The planning application was refused by the Council in part with regard to concerns over the provision of car parking at the property as well as urban greening and landscaping.
4. Additional plans have been submitted with the appeal. Drawing 3664 FP-07 Revision 08-10-2025 shows a parking space to the front of the property at 90 degrees to Robson Avenue and accessed by a crossover. Urban Greening Factor calculations have also been submitted which demonstrate an Urban Greening Factor in excess of the required 0.4. I do not consider that accepting those documents would prejudice any party and I have considered them as part of the appeal.
5. Given the details that have been submitted, I consider that were I minded to allow the appeal, concerns over these matters could be overcome by conditioning the details shown on the documents. I will not therefore consider the matters outlined in refusal reasons 2 or 3 further.

Main Issue

6. The main issue therefore is the effect of the proposal on the development strategy of the Borough with regard to the distribution of family sized dwellings.

Reasons

7. The existing property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling, which incorporates four bedrooms and front and back gardens, set on Robson Avenue. The site is within a

London location with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 2. The higher the score, the higher the connectivity to public transport services, on a scale ranging from 0 to 6b.

8. The Council recognise that conversion of the existing housing stock into smaller dwellings provides many additional homes across the Council area. However, it also recognises that family housing to meet local needs is a priority in Brent.
9. With that need in mind and including consideration as to the sustainability of the location of the proposed development, the conversion of family homes to two dwellings amongst other criteria could be supported where that property is within a PTAL area scoring 3 or above. Given that the property is located within a location with a PTAL score of 2, the connectivity level of the site does not lend itself to such a conversion being in a location where the Council seeks to retain family sized dwellings.
10. The proposal would therefore conflict with the development strategy for Brent to protect family sized dwellings within the Council area that are less well connected to public transport services. To allow the proposal would serve to undermine the required housing mix within the Borough given that there is a need to retain family sized dwellings and permitting the scheme would subsequently conflict with the development strategy for the area.
11. The proposal would not accord with Policy BH11 of the Brent Local Plan (2022) (LP) which amongst other things only allows the conversion of a family sized home where certain criteria are all met, including the need for the site to be within PTAL 3 or above. The proposal would also conflict with Policy BH4 of the LP which advises that proposals of this type will be supported in amongst other locations within PTAL 3-6.

Other Matters

12. I note the appellants position that the site is well served by public transport, and that they note the close proximity of bus routes to Dollis Hill Station, connections to local cycle routes and the availability of nearby services and facilities. I also note the suggested low car ownership levels and that cycle storage would be provided at the site. However, I place significant weight on the PTAL classification of the site, (which is not contested by the appellant), especially given that is the requirement outlined within the LP.
13. I note that the flats could be set up to minimise reliance on artificial heating and lighting and provide EV charging, although these matters would not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion

14. There are no considerations, including the Framework¹ which indicate that a decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with the development plan with which the proposal would conflict. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

T Burnham

INSPECTOR

¹ National Planning Policy Framework 2024.