



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2025

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/25/3366293

17 Elmwood Crescent, London, NW9 0NL

- 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 Ms Zara Zaman against the decision of the Council to the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 25/0208.
 - The development proposed is described as demolition of existing side garage and rear storage and erection of single storey side to rear wrap around extension with front porch extension to the dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The first main issue is the effect of the proposed porch on the character and appearance of host dwelling and this street scene. The second main issue is the effect of the proposed wrap around extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of 16 Elmwood Crescent, with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is located within a cul-de-sac at the end of Elmwood Crescent. The cul-de-sac is characterised by uniformly designed pairs of traditionally designed houses with projecting two storey bays under gable roofs. Some of the dwellings have been altered and extended and this includes garage and other side extensions; the enclosure of the recessed front entrances; modest sized projecting canopies over the front doors; and hip to gable roof extensions. Despite these changes there remains a strong sense of rhythm and uniformity within individual pairs of dwellings and the street scene.
4. The pairs of dwellings are set in from their outer side boundaries and some of the resultant gaps include garages and extensions. Most of these garages and extensions are set back from the front building lines of the dwellings, which adds to the sense of space and separation between the pairs of dwellings.
5. Conversely, the character of the rest of Elmwood Crescent is more diverse. It includes two and three storey flat and pitched roof flats developments, a small modern two and half storey housing development, a parking area and the side/rear elevations of a row of commercial buildings.

6. The appeal property is situated within a row of four uniformly designed houses within the first section of the cul-de-sac. They have similar front building lines and whilst two of the front recessed entrances have been enclosed their original curved design and form is evident.
7. Between the two pairs of dwellings are two flat roofed attached garages which are broadly in line with the front elevations of the dwellings and utilitarian in appearance. There is also another small side extension towards the rear of the host dwelling which fills the gap between the original dwelling and the boundary with No.16. To the rear of No.16 there is an outbuilding that sits adjacent to the boundary with the appeal site, just beyond the existing rear building line of the appeal dwelling.
8. Together and amongst other things policies DMP1 and BD1 of the London Borough of Brent - Brent Local Plan (LP), require new development to be of the highest architectural and urban design quality and to provide high levels of internal and external amenity. It should complement the locality and comply with the relevant criteria set out in the design policies in the London Plan and Brent's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
9. SPD section 3.8 states that porches must complement the character, setting, balance and proportions of the host dwelling. In most cases they should not extend forward of any projecting features unless it is a common feature within the area. SPD section 3.1 advises that single storey rear extensions to semi-detached houses could be the full width of the house and up to 6 metres deep. Rear extensions that are more than 3 metres deep should have an eaves height of no more than 2.5 metres along the boundary to any neighbouring property. The guidance goes on to state that there are exceptions to the above and that extensions must not have a significant negative impact on the outlook or amenity space of any neighbouring properties.
10. Consistent with this the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (the Framework), encourages sustainable forms of development and at paragraphs 131 and 135 state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Proposals should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, add to the overall character of the area; optimise the development potential of a site; and provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. The appellant has referred to policies D3 and D4 of The London Plan which have similar objectives.
11. The Council has confirmed that prior approval is not required for a single storey rear extension which projects across the width of the original dwelling. The proposed wrap around extension would project across almost all the width of the rear garden and along the side of the existing house where it would fill the gap between the original dwelling and the boundary with No.16. The proposed extension would project just over one metre to the front of the dwelling and across the existing front entrance. Other than a mono-pitched roof over the front section, the extension would have a flat roof. The overall height of the extension would vary to take account of the falling ground levels towards the front of the dwelling.
12. The rear element of the proposed extension would be visually uncluttered and would have rendered walls to match the host dwelling. Together with its combined depth and width, it would help offset the dominant appearance of the hip to gable and flat roofed dormer extension. The main side element of the proposed extension would be modest in width and contained at the side of the dwelling and would replace the existing side garage. For these reasons the rear and side elements of the proposed extension would respect the existing dwelling and the rear garden environment.
13. Conversely, due to its combined depth, width and proximity to the projecting bay window, the proposed extension would fail to respect the proportions of the host building. The harm it would cause to the character and appearance of the host building, the row of semi-

detached dwellings and the street scene would be exacerbated by the utilitarian angular design of the front elevation of the proposed extension.

14. The existing porch at 10 Elmwood Crescent is quite distinct from the appeal proposal. The nearby redevelopment schemes referred to by the appellant are not comparable as they do not front onto this part of Elmwood Crescent, or involve the extension of an existing traditionally designed dwelling, which makes apposite contribution to the street scene. Also, the proposed extension falls outside the scope of current permitted development rights. As required by planning law, where an extension or front porch requires planning permission it has to be determined in accordance with the prevailing development plan and in light of its planning merits. The appeal has been determined on this basis.
15. For these reasons the front wrap around element of the proposed extension would appear prominent, lacking in design quality and totally out of keeping with the host dwelling, the adjacent semi-detached dwellings and the street scene.
16. This harm would outweigh the merits of the rear and side elements of the proposed extension and the benefits provided by the proposed additional accommodation for the appellant and their family. Further having regard to the extent of the concerns raised it is not a matter that could be adequately dealt with by the imposition of a condition.
17. I conclude on the first main issue that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with LP Policies DMP1 & BD1 and the SPD.

Living conditions

18. The rear element of the proposed extension would be sited to the southeast of the dwelling and outside sitting area at No.16 and would taper away from their shared boundary. Due to the orientation of the dwelling at No.16 and the alignment of the rear gardens the proposed rear element of the proposed extension would be prominent and would have an unduly enclosing impact on the outlook from the adjacent rear facing windows and sitting out area at the rear of the dwelling at No.16.
19. Its enclosing impact would be exacerbated by the side element of the proposed extension, which would run along the side boundary between the two dwellings. Whilst it is noted that there are currently two side extensions to the side of the appeal dwelling, they are sited to the front and rear of the dwelling and are modest in height. Conversely the proposed extension would be materially taller and would project in front of the large side kitchen window at No.16.
20. Overall, due to its length and proximity to No.16 the proposal would have an overbearing and enclosing impact on the outlook from that property. Although the occupiers of No.16 have not raised any concerns, this does not mitigate the harm that would be caused by the proposal.
21. Finally, it is noted that the proposed rear element of the extension would run along the side boundary with No.18 Elmwood Crescent. However, the impact of the proposal would be very similar to that of a rear extension which the Council has confirmed does not require prior approval.
22. I conclude on the second main issue that the proposal would unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No.16, due to its overbearing visual impact. It would conflict with LP Policy DMP1 and the SPD.

Conclusion.

23. Having regard to the conclusions on both main issues and taking all other factors raised into account, the appeal is dismissed.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR