



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2024

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/24/3345942

90 Valley Drive, Brent, London NW9 9NS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Najib Kashefi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 24/0367.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side and rear extension, a part ground floor front and rear infill extension, and a front porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and the area; and
 - the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to the outlook from, and availability of light at, 92 Valley Drive.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The host forms one half of a semi-detached pair, which sits amongst other broadly similar pairs on Valley Drive. The properties typically display prominent two storey bay windows on their front elevations, and are finished in a palette of brick, render and hanging tiles.
4. The proposed side extension would be set back from the host's front face at first floor level, and its roof would be set down slightly compared to the existing ridgeline. Although the set back and the set down would be less than advised in the Brent Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document No 2 (2018) ('SPD'), it would be sufficient to provide a degree of articulation and subordination, and to avoid a terracing effect.
5. However, at ground floor the proposal would include a front extension which would attach to the host's bay window, and which would square-off the property's plan form. As a result, the locally distinctive bay window would no longer project forward relative to the remainder of the property, and it would become notably less prominent in the streetscene. Given that the front

extension would be linked to the front bay, it would detract from the architectural character of the house and the area, and it would conflict with the advice at paragraph 2.7 of the SPD.

6. The host has already been significantly enlarged, with a hip to gable conversion, and a rear dormer which extends across most of its roof. Additionally, work also appears to have started on a large single storey extension, in accordance with prior approval application reference 17/5035.
7. The scheme would include a hipped-roof rear projection at first floor which would link to the proposed side extension and the existing rear dormer. Having regard to cumulative impacts, seen from the rear, the resultant property would have a very eclectic appearance, and little of the host's original form, scale or style would still be legible. Whilst that elevation is not visible in the streetscene, and notwithstanding the proposed use of matching materials and fenestration, that harmful impact would be clearly apparent from the rear faces and gardens of many surrounding properties.
8. Given the harm that the scheme would cause to the character and appearance of the host and the area, it would conflict with Policies DMP1 and BD1 of the Brent Local Plan 2019 - 2041 (2022) ('BLP'). Amongst other things, and in general terms, these require new development to be of the highest architectural and design quality, and that its scale and detailing should complement the locality.

Living conditions

9. The SPD states that ground floor extensions which are greater than 3 metres in depth should be set well in from the boundary with the adjacent property. The proposed ground floor infill extension would be set-in only marginally from the boundary with 92 Valley Drive ('No 92'), contrary to that advice.
10. However, No 92 has a car port to the side, such that its main habitable area is well away from the boundary with No 90. Seen from No 92's nearest rear facing openings, the infill extension would be off-set well to one side, and given its fairly limited height, notwithstanding the difference in levels, it would not have a harmfully overbearing impact, or cause a significant loss of light.
11. The rear face of the proposed two storey extension would broadly align with No 92's single storey rear extension. I have limited evidence to enable me to assess the extent to which it would breach the SPD's '1:2 guide' with regards to No 92's nearest first floor window. However, that window is set well in from the boundary, and the main outlook from it, which is straight down that property's rear garden, would be largely unaffected.
12. Given that the proposed rear extensions would be close to only a short section of No 92's long rear garden, those occupiers' enjoyment of their outdoor amenity space, when considered as a whole, would not be significantly harmed.
13. Thus, notwithstanding the conflict with the SPD, I am satisfied that the scheme would not cause the occupiers at No 92 to suffer an overbearing sense of enclosure, or result in a significant loss of light. As it would not harmfully impact their living conditions, it would not conflict with that part of BLP Policy DMP1 which requires development to provide high levels of internal and external amenity, having regard to matters such as outlook and daylighting.

Conclusion

14. I have found that whilst the scheme would not harmfully impact the living conditions at 92 Valley Drive, it would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. Consequently, having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR