



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 July 2024

by C Rafferty LLB (Hons), Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/23/3333598

9-11 Crest Road, London NW2 7LT

- 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 Yahia Al Wadi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 23/2771, dated 18 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 12 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear extensions at 9 and 11 Crest Road
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The site address has been taken from the Council's decision notice as it is more accurate than that provided on the application form. During my visit I also observed features at the site that do not appear on the plans I have before me. Nevertheless, I must make my decision on the basis of the submitted plans and have proceeded on this basis.
3. Since the determination of this application, the Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been amended. As a result, I consider that there is no requirement for me to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by my taking this approach.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises 9 and 11 Crest Road, a pair of semi-detached dwellings. In accordance with the plans, both dwellings have ground floor rear projections, with No. 9 also having a partial first floor rear extension and a full-width rear dormer at roof level. The surrounding area is residential in nature and, despite the range of rear alterations and additions at ground and roof level in the immediate area, the properties remain overall modest in nature with limited first floor rear extensions visible within the immediate surrounds of the site.

6. The proposal seeks to erect a first-floor rear extension at the site. It would be constructed from materials to match the host properties. However, it would also match the depth of the ground floor projections and, together with the partial first floor extension at No. 9, would give the impression of a first floor extension spanning across the entire width of the pair of properties.
7. Accordingly, the proposal would appear as a prominent feature at the site, adding a significant amount of built form to the properties that, when viewed alongside the other rear alterations already in place, would result in the rear elevations of the site appearing unduly bulky. While it would not be experienced from Crest Road, clear views of it would be possible from rear gardens of immediately neighbouring dwellings. It would fail to respect the nature and proportions of the modest host properties and, alongside the limited additions and alterations at first floor level in this immediate section of the street, would read as out of place and unduly dominant in context.
8. The proposal would incorporate a flat roof. In this regard I note the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD2 (the SPD), which states that the design, shape and materials of the roof of two storey rear extensions should match the original roof. However, this is guidance rather than policy. Among the prevalence of flat roofs visible from the rear of the site, both at neighbouring dwellings and accounting for the dormer at No. 9, the introduction of a hipped roof as part of the proposal would appear out of place and disjointed. The flat roof as proposed would instead, in this precise location, reflect surrounding development. Nevertheless, it remains that even with the flat roof the overall bulk of the proposal would cause visual harm as outlined above.
9. For the reasons given, the proposal would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would fail to comply with Policies BD1 and DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 and the SPD insofar as they seek to ensure development is of a design and scale that complements the locality.

Other Matters

10. The main parties agree that the proposal would not result in harm to the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. This represents a lack of harm, neutral in the overall planning balance.
11. The proposal would provide additional space for the current residents, this is a private benefit that would attract little weight. While it would also optimise the use of the site, even when taken together with the weight attached to the private benefit, this would not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, the proposal would not accord with the development plan when taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Rafferty

INSPECTOR