



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2022

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/22/3296164
87 Slough Lane, London, NW9 8YB

- 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 P Bhudia against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 21/4264, dated 18 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey front extension and single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the erection of a single-storey rear extension.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the erection of a single-storey front extension and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single-storey front extension at 87 Slough Lane, London, NW9 8YB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/4264, dated 18 November 2021, and the plans submitted with it so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The single-storey front extension hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drg Nos JB/PB/P/001 Rev A, JB/PB/P/002 Rev A, JB/PB/P/003 Rev A and JB/PB/P/004 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the single-storey front extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

3. I have used the description of development that was given by the Council and notified to the appellant at the time of the application. This was used on the decision notice and repeated by the appellant on the appeal form. This gives an accurate but more detailed description of the proposal compared with that on the application form.
 4. Since the date of the decision the Council has adopted the *Brent Local Plan 2019-2014* (LP) in February 2022. The *Brent Development Management*
-

Policies Plan 2016 has been revoked and its Policy DMP1, as referred to in the Council's decision, is no longer relevant. The Council has forwarded a copy of Policy DMP1 from the new LP in support of their decision. The appellant was invited to comment. I have considered the appeal having regard to the up-to-date development plan.

Main Issues

5. The proposal comprises two separate elements. The main issues are:
- The effect of the proposed single-storey rear extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the living conditions at 89 Slough Lane, with particular regard to visual impact and light, and
 - The effect of the proposed single-storey front extension on the character and appearance of the host property and wider street scene.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling, previously enlarged with a two-storey side extension, a rear dormer window, and a single-storey rear extension across approximately half the width of the plot and adjacent to the unattached neighbour at No 85. The proposed single-storey rear extension would fill the void between the existing extension and No 89 with a conservatory type addition finished with a glazed roof and solid, parapet wall along the boundary with the neighbouring property. The front extension would bring an existing mono-pitched roof at single-storey height forward and across the property's frontage as an enclosed porch aligning with and connecting to the side of an existing bay window, and with a further projecting canopy roof over the front entrance door.

The Single-Storey Rear Extension

7. The Council's adopted *Residential Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2* (SPD) includes detailed guidance for single-storey rear extensions. It advises that they should be designed to respect the character and size of the house, and that for semi-detached properties the maximum depth normally permitted is 3m from the wall of the house. It goes on to state that an extension up to 6m in depth may be acceptable providing that for every additional metre beyond 3m the extension should be set in from the boundary by an additional metre. The reason for this is expressly stated to protect neighbouring residential amenity.
8. The proposed extension would align with the depth of the existing extension, projecting over 7m beyond the dwelling's rear building line. In combination with the existing, the ground floor rear extensions would be large. Nevertheless, they would generally complement each other in terms of appearance and materials, and their visual impact would be very localised and largely unseen beyond the immediate confines of the appeal site. The property would retain a deep garden such that the addition would not appear cramped in its setting. Overall, I am not persuaded that the rear extension would have any unacceptable impact upon the character or appearance of No 87 or the wider character of the area.
9. The proposed extension would exceed the guidelines contained within the SPD by extending adjacent to the common boundary with No 89 by more than 3m.

No 89 is un-extended beyond its original form to the rear. The circumstances between the semi-detached pair at Nos 87 and 89 are not unusual or unique. They appear to me to be precisely those where the SPD guidance is intended to apply in order to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

10. At around 3m high and over 7m long, the flank wall of the extension would present itself to No 89 along the common boundary between both properties as a reasonably tall and long enclosure. It would be clearly seen as having a dominant and imposing presence in the outlook from inside No 89 and from the private garden space immediately adjoining the rear elevation, projecting well above the height of the existing boundary wall or any usual residential means of enclosure. Its harmful impact would be precisely what the SPD guidance seeks to avoid. Due to its height and depth, the extension would be likely to lead to some loss of daylight within the living space to the rear of No 89, but more significantly I find the proposed rear extension would be overbearing and visually intrusive to the detriment of the neighbour's living conditions. Its failure to achieve a high level of amenity at No 89 means that there would be clear conflict with LP Policy DMP1.

The Single-Storey Front Extension

11. The SPD states that front extensions will not be permitted unless these are the predominant character of the area and that in most cases a porch should not project beyond or connect to a bay window or garage.
12. Slough Lane comprises a range of property styles, many of repeat design peppered along the street scene. No 87 has been altered beyond its original form such that the original symmetry of this semi-detached pair has already been unbalanced to a degree. Moreover, many other similar properties in the immediate area have had a variety of alterations to their front elevations, including extensions that adjoin and/or extend forward of bay windows. Despite these obvious changes, there remains a pleasing cohesion to the character of the area derived through a general commonality in scale and form to the house types, and complementary use of materials.
13. The appeal proposal would merely add further to an existing mix of single-storey extensions and alterations to the area. There would be no further significant change to the existing balance of this semi-detached pair, and the bay window would remain as a dominant and legible feature of the building's composition. Furthermore, being recessed behind the property's reasonably deep frontage, and finished with materials to match the existing, which could be secured by condition, the front extension would appear no more dominant or intrusive than any of the other alterations within the street scene. I am satisfied that this element of the proposal would not appear harmful to the character or appearance of No 87 or the wider area and as such it would display the design quality required by LP Policy DMP1.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given, and notwithstanding the absence of any neighbour objection to the proposal, I find that the single-storey rear extension would be harmful to the adjoining occupier's living conditions. In relation to this part of the proposal the appeal fails.

15. I find that the proposed front extension would be comfortable within the street scene and complementary to the established character of the area. As the two parts of the proposal are clearly severable, it is appropriate for me to issue a split decision. I therefore allow the appeal as it relates to the proposed single-storey front extension subject to a condition specifying the relevant plans, which is necessary to provide certainty, and one to ensure that the materials used would match the existing, which is necessary in order to protect the character and appearance of the area.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR