



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2026

by T Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/25/3375873

Land to the North of 125 Preston Road, Wembley HA9 8NN

- 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 C & D Property Management Services Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 25/1246.
 - The development proposed is new-build two-storey three-bedroom house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the proposal has been shortened in the banner heading above. I have considered the nature of the land on which the proposal would be located and its location as part of my assessment of the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The proposed dwelling would be attached to an established pair of semi detached dwellings fronting onto Preston Road. The appeal site forms a grass verge adjacent to Pellatt Road close to its junction with Preston Road which along with the planted verge on the opposite side of the road affords the approach into Pellatt Road from Preston Road a sense of spaciousness which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. I accept that the design of property within the area is somewhat mixed. Established and typical 'metroland' houses extend out along Preston Road whilst more modern properties incorporating flat roofs are in evidence at Walton Gardens. Further modern flatted development can be observed at Orchard Gardens and Aylands Close. These do however form individual cohesive developments set within their own grounds.
6. Within this wider context I do not therefore consider that a contemporary design approach would always be inappropriate. I note the proposal seeks to reinterpret and evolve elements of the local architectural character through a contemporary yet context-sensitive approach. The proposal follows the building line of the

adjacent properties. A building of contemporary design already appears to have been granted approval further along Pellatt Road.

7. However, given the limitations of the proposed plot, which is effectively formed of a roadside verge, the dwelling would be attached to the side elevation of No.125 Preston Road (No.125).
8. No.125 and the neighbouring No.123 share a typical and traditional design, materials and scale reflective of semi-detached houses of their age within the local area. The proposed house, by reason of its substantially differing design including its roof form, detailing and massing would sharply contrast with the existing semi-detached pair in this prominent location adjacent to Preston Road.
9. This, combined with the attachment to No.125 and the positioning on the verge at the junction only serve to accentuate the design differences which would lead to the proposal forming a visually uncomfortable development which would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.
10. The proposal would therefore conflict with policies BD1 and DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan (2022) (BLP). Amongst other things these policies support innovative and contemporary design but where it respects and complements historic character and they support development of a scale, type and design that compliments the locality.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

11. The dwelling would be sustainably built and would be located to access local transport links and would contribute to the supply of family sized housing in the borough as a small site. There would be economic and social benefits which can usually always be attributed to a development of this size.
12. However, the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and the benefits of the scheme would not outweigh the harm. The proposal would conflict with the BLP and there are no considerations which indicate a decision otherwise than in accordance with it.
13. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

T Burnham

INSPECTOR