



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2024

by B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/24/3336962
91 Pasture Road, Wembley, HA0 3JW.

- 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 Ms Barbara Corrado against the decision of Brent Council.
- The application Ref 23/1889, dated 31 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2023.
- The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor side extension of 4.5m with rear dormer loft window.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a first-floor side extension of 4.5m with rear dormer loft window at 91 Pasture Road, Wembley, HA0 3JW, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/1889, dated 31 May 2023, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - Location Map (1:1250) and Site Plan 17/071_S0
 - Existing Ground-Floor Plan 17/071_S1
 - Existing First-Floor and Roof Plans 17/071_S2
 - Existing Elevations 17/071_S3
 - Proposed Ground-Floor Plan 17/071_P1
 - Proposed First-Floor and Roof Plans 17/071_P2
 - Proposed Elevations 17/071_P3
 - Proposed 3D Visuals 17/071_R5
 - Proposed 3D Elevations 17/071_R5
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect the proposed first-floor side extension would have on the character and appearance of No 91 Pasture Road itself, on the semi-detached pair of dwellings of which it forms part, and on the wider street scene of Pasture Road and neighbouring Paxford Road and The Crescent, within the Sudbury Court Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. Policy DMP1 of the adopted Brent Local Plan (BLP) includes the requirements that, to be acceptable, development should be of siting, layout, materials and design that complements the locality and conserves or enhances the significance of heritage assets. Policy BHC1 of the BLP specifically concerns proposals affecting a heritage asset, such as a conservation area, and requires that they demonstrate a clear understanding of the architectural or historic significance and wider context of the asset and sustain or enhance its significance, respecting and reinforcing the street scene. These provisions are essentially consistent with the requirements of national policy and planning law that the character or appearance of a CA should be preserved or enhanced. An adopted Sudbury Court CA Design Guide includes advice to restrict the width of side extensions to 3.5m.
4. This part of Sudbury Court CA is characterised by substantial, semi-detached pairs of two-storey dwellings. At the junctions between the estate roads, these dwellings invariably have white-coloured walls under visibly distinctive, bright green-tiled, hipped roofs, in contrast with the more traditional finish of other frontage houses. These corner properties are set at about 45 degrees to the road junctions, creating a sense of spaciousness.
5. The appeal property, semi-detached from No 10 The Crescent and standing at the junction of The Crescent with Pasture Road and Paxford Road, is consistent with this characteristic development pattern.
6. There is a history of unsuccessful appeals for progressively narrower first floor extensions to the appeal property, of which the present proposal for a 4.5m wide extension is the most recent. Each case is decided on individual merit.
7. In the present case, the hipped-roofed first floor addition, whilst exceeding the guideline width of 3.5m, would be substantially set back from the main front elevation and well below the main roof ridge. In form and finish it would match and complement the existing construction, in such a way that I do not consider that it would cause any harm to the character or appearance of the host dwelling.
8. The visually prominent pair, formed of the appeal property and No 10 The Crescent, has lost its original, harmonious, visual balance because, on the opposite side from the existing and proposed side extensions to No 91 Pasture Road, there is a substantial, flat-roofed, ground floor extension to No 10.
9. This imbalance is, to some extent, already detrimental to the visual harmony of the street scene around the junction. The question for the present appeal is whether the development now proposed would increase such impact and so fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Sudbury Court CA as a whole.
10. I note that other similar corner properties, including the one directly opposite the appeal site, have been subject to sideways extension, and I have found the proposed extension acceptable in itself. In the circumstances, despite the resulting modest increase in the volume of the appeal dwelling, I do not consider that the extension proposed in this appeal would increase any adverse visual impact on the street scene of the wider Sudbury Court CA.

11. For these reasons, I regard the appeal proposal as compliant with Policies BHC1 and DMP1 of the BLP, and national planning policy, with respect to the siting, layout, materials and design of the proposed extension and its effect on the street scene of the Sudbury Court CA.
12. I conclude that the appeal should succeed and that the planning permission sought should be granted, subject only to the standard conditions set out above.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR