

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2024

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/23/3344135

86 Barn Hill, Wembley, Brent, HA9 9LQ

- 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 Mrs Zainab Jefain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 23/1537, dated 1 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 20 February 2024.
 - The development proposed is erecting new side double storey side extension and adding on an existing rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a single storey garage stepped back to the side, located within a residential area.
 4. The appeal property is situated within the Barn Hill Conservation Area which is characterised by the presence of mock Tudor detached and semi-detached dwellings set out on garden plots on a hillside above Wembley Stadium.
 5. Common design features including decorative half-timbering, mullioned windows, and two storey gables are complemented by the regular set-back of dwellings from wide, spacious streets. Dwellings are set within comfortable garden plots, with gardens and/or driveways to the front and longer gardens to the rear. This results in an attractive sense of uniformity and the presence of grass verges, street trees, hedgerows and planting provides for a green and spacious quality.
 6. Whilst I observed during my site visit that many dwellings in the area have been altered and/or extended, I noted that such changes generally appear to be
-

in keeping with and respect the host dwelling and the character of the Barn Hill Conservation Area.

7. The proposed two storey side extension would effectively subsume the existing garage and in doing so, it would result in a side extension considerably wider than the maximum recommended width for side extensions set out in the Council's Barn Hill Conservation Area Design Guide (2013).
8. The proposed side extension would not be set back from the host dwelling's front elevation but it would be flush to it at both ground floor and first floor level. As a result, I find that the proposal would fail to appear as a subservient addition to the dwelling and rather, it would result in a dwelling that would appear excessively wide and ill-proportioned.
9. Currently, the front elevation of the dwelling is, like that of neighbouring dwellings, notable for its well-proportioned characteristics, which include a projecting two storey front gable and a stepped back single storey garage, with a matching gable feature. In failing to respect these features, the very wide two storey extension without any set-back, as proposed, would draw undue attention to itself as an unsympathetic, dominant and bulky addition.
10. The harm arising from the above would be exacerbated as a result of the proposed crown roof which, in order to accommodate the wide extension, would appear excessively large, adding significantly to an overly bulky and unduly dominant appearance. Consequently, the proposal would appear out of keeping with the identified qualities of the Barn Hill Conservation Area.
11. Further to the above, the proposal also includes a large single storey rear extension. This would project very considerably to the rear and would extend across the full width of the dwelling to the rear. I find that this, combined with the proposed flat roof, all set above a raised patio as the garden drops away below, would result in an overly large and bulky addition, out of character with the host dwelling.
12. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would appear intrusive and incongruous and that this would be to the detriment of the Barn Hill Conservation Area's qualities. Having regard to paragraph 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and to Planning Practice Guidance, I consider that the harm to the character and appearance of the Barn Hill Conservation Area would be less than substantial. This needs to be balanced against any public benefits the development may bring.
13. In this regard, there is nothing before me that comprises or amounts to a public benefit that outweighs the harm identified.
14. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the Barn Hill Conservation Area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, to Policies BHC1 and DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan (2022) and to the Council's Barn Hill Conservation Area Design Guide (2013), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Living conditions

15. The proposed single storey rear extension would extend very close to the boundary with Number 84 Barn Hill. Beyond the long rear projection of the proposal, a raised patio is proposed.
16. The combined rear extension and patio would extend well beyond the rear of No 84, in very close proximity. The proximity, height and projection of the proposed rear extension would result in it appearing as an unduly dominant feature adjacent to the shared boundary between the appeal property and No 84.
17. Further, the immediate presence of a raised patio that would extend well beyond the proposed rear extension would, I find, result in considerable scope for the overlooking of the rear of No 84, with a consequential loss of privacy and perceived loss of privacy for the occupiers of No 84.
18. 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 Policies BHC1 and DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan (2022) which, amongst other things, seek to protect residential amenity.

Conclusion

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

N McGurk

INSPECTOR