



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 October 2021

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 October 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/21/3278111
2 Oakington Manor Drive, Wembley, HA9 6LT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Clovis Stephenson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 21/0808, dated 22 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side and single storey rear extension with part 2 storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. A previous application for demolition of single storey garage at front, proposed two storey side and single storey rear extension with part two storey rear extension with addition of Juliet style balcony to rear of dwellinghouse was refused¹.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and its effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with regards to outlook, daylight and privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two storey end of terrace dwelling with a small detached garage to the side. It is located towards the end of Oakington Manor Drive, close to Harrow Road. Oakington Manor Drive is residential in character, largely comprising two storey semi-detached dwellings, as well as occasional terraced and detached properties, including a bungalow located to the side of the appeal property. Harrow Road is a mixed use area, largely characterised by the presence of two and three storey terraces, with commercial uses at ground floor level and flats above.

¹ Reference: 20/2457.

5. Houses along Oakington Manor Drive tend to be set back from the pavement behind short gardens and/or parking areas, with longer gardens to the rear. The presence of wide grass verges and street trees affords an ordered, green and spacious quality to the area. Further, the dwellings that form the terrace, within which the appeal property is located, share attractive characteristics, including bays, gables and porchways, among other original features and this adds to the area's attractive sense of uniformity.
6. The proposed development would extend the appeal property to the side and rear at a two storey height. Both the set-back of the two storey side extension and the setting down of the proposal's roof from the main ridge would be less than that recommended by the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: SPD2 Residential Extensions and Alterations (2018). I find that this would result in the proposed development appearing unduly bulky and prominent, not least as the side extension would extend to two-thirds of the width of the host property.
7. As a consequence of the above, the proposal would fail to appear subservient to the host property and would draw attention to itself as an incongruous addition. This would be to the detriment of the host property, to the terrace within which it sits and to the uniform and spacious qualities of the area.
8. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Brent Development Management Policies Plan (2016) Policy DMP1; and to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: SPD2 Residential Extensions and Alterations (2018), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Living conditions

9. As noted above, there is a bungalow, Number 2A Oakington Manor Drive, to one side of the appeal property. The proposed rear extension would project well beyond the rear elevation of No 2A and in very close proximity to it.
10. I consider that the two storey height and close proximity of the proposal would combine to result in its side flank wall appearing to "loom above" No 2A when seen from the rear of that property. In this regard, the proposal would draw attention to itself as an unduly dominant feature, to the detriment of the outlook of the occupiers of No 2A.
11. Further to the above, the juxtaposition of the dwellings is such that the rear of the appeal property faces directly out over a significant area of the rear garden of Number 4 Oakington Manor Drive. The first floor windows to the proposed rear extension would include full height doors and a Juliet balcony which would look down upon and over the rear garden of No 4 from close proximity and in an imposing manner.
12. I find that this would impact severely on the privacy of the occupiers of No 4, as much of their rear garden would have a strong sense of being directly overlooked.
13. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposal would harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with regards to outlook and privacy,

contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Brent Development Management Policies Plan (2016) Policy DMP1; and to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: SPD2 Residential Extensions and Alterations (2018), which together amongst other things, seek to protect residential amenity.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR