



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 March 2023

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/23/3314413

5 Crundale Avenue, Brent, London, NW9 9PJ

- 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 Basir Ahmed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 22/2536, dated 22 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and rear extension, erection of two storey side and single storey rear extension to dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description of the proposal from the Council's decision notice. It adequately and simply describes the proposed development instead of the much longer and detailed description given on the application form.
3. During my visit demolition and rebuilding work was evident on the site. However, it appeared that the works related to previous planning consents and were not relevant to the proposal. As such, I have determined the appeal based on the plans submitted, rather than on the basis of retrospective permission being sought.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. Houses within Crundale Road and the adjoining Valley Drive share similar designs. They are mainly semi-detached with 2 storey front projecting bays with pitched roof gable ends decorated with mock tudor beams. Roofs are hipped to the side and most houses have attached side garages that meet the boundary of neighbouring properties, often projecting slightly forward of the main house wall.
6. The Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (SPD) proscribes the distance that a first floor side extension should be set back from the main wall of a house and down from the roof ridge, to ensure an appropriate level of subordination and prevent a terracing effect.

The proposed development would fall significantly short of both requirements. Nonetheless, the ground floor side extension on the neighbouring house, No 3, would ensure that there would be a gap between the properties at first floor level and to some extent avoid a terracing effect.

7. However, all first floor side extensions that I saw on houses within both roads were significantly set back from their main walls. In this regard they appeared to accord with the SPD, were subordinate to their respective host dwellings, and provided a uniformity to the pattern and layout of side extensions that contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The proposed first floor extension would be set back approximately 0.4m from the main front wall and 1.2m from the side extension wall which projects forward of it, rather than the 2.5m SPD requirement. The combination of a higher roof ridge and smaller set back would result in a more dominant and conspicuously different development to similar extensions nearby, causing harm to the appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore conflict with the requirements of the SPD and Policy DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 (2022) which requires development to complement the locality in terms of its design.

Other Matters

9. A nearby resident raised concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on their living conditions, but in view of my conclusions on the main issue there is no need for me to address these in the current decision.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR