



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2025

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/25/3366774

93 Barn Hill, Wembley, Brent, HA9 9LW

- 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 Behrooz Talavoky against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 25/0762.
 - The development proposed is the addition of a light well, drop kerb to accommodate parking space for 1 vehicle and installation of EV charger.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the addition of a light well, drop kerb to accommodate parking space for 1 vehicle and installation of EV charger at 93 Barn Hill, Wembley, Brent, HA9 9LW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/0762, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Drg Nos 93BH/01 Issue A, 93BH/02 Issue A, 93BH/03 Issue A, 93BH/04 Issue A and 93BH/05.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the reconstruction and repair of the existing front boundary wall shall match those used in the existing wall.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are: - (1) whether the proposal would result in excessive levels of off-street parking at the appeal property, and its effect upon highway safety, and (2) the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the Barn Hill Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached, split-level house which occupies a corner location within a residential suburb and sits within the Barn Hill Conservation Area (CA). Due to the topography of the area, the property appears single-storey to the front and two-storey to the rear. There is an existing pavement crossover and gated vehicular access to a single-parking space to the rear along the site's return boundary to Barn Rise. The proposal is to create a pavement crossover to the front from Barn Hill to access a single width parking space upon a new driveway and

which would be served from a new EV charger installed within a small lightwell that is also proposed to the front of the dwelling.

Parking and Highway Safety

4. Policy BT2 of the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 (BLP), adopted in 2022, deals with parking and car free development. The policy refers to the Council's parking standards within BLP Appendix 4 which in turn defers to the parking standards for new residential development set out within The London Plan 2021 (LP) as detailed within LP Policy T6.1 and Table 10.3. For an outer London location with a Public Transport Access Level (PTAL) rating 0-1, as is the case in this instance, the maximum parking provision is up to 1.5 spaces per dwelling.
5. Along with the existing off-street parking space to the rear of the appeal property, the proposal would create a total of two off-street spaces for the dwelling. This would exceed that specified within LP Policy T6.1. However, the proposal does not amount to a new residential development in the sense that no new dwelling units are proposed to be created. Furthermore, the reasoned justification for BLP Policy BT2 explains that the amount of parking provided in accordance with parking standards is a balance between a number of factors. With no evidence before me of any parking pressures on the streets surrounding the appeal property, where on-street parking appeared freely available to me, effectively limitless other than in specifically controlled locations at junctions, I find it difficult to understand how the proposal for one additional space at No 93 would encourage additional car ownership or that it would somehow create additional car use. The proposal would merely provide a more convenient parking opportunity to the front of the appeal property within its curtilage, and within an area that is otherwise poorly served by public transport.
6. Moreover, Policy BT2 does not directly limit the provision of additional parking but instead sets out specific criteria to be met when it is proposed, as does BLP Policy BT4, which deals with the formation of an access to a road. Based on my own observations, and without any information to the contrary, the surrounding streets are not heavily parked and therefore there would be no additional on-street parking demand or shortfall of publicly available parking on-street as a result of the proposal. There is no evidence to suggest that there would be any detrimental impact to the existing parking controls that operate in the area during event days at the nearby Wembley Stadium. Matters relating to the visual impact of the proposal are dealt with below. Suffice to say here for the purpose of Policies BT2 and BT4, I am satisfied the proposal would be visually acceptable by maintaining the character and appearance of the surrounding area and with adequate space for soft landscaping across the remainder of the property's frontage.
7. The width of the proposed pavement crossover is shown on the plans as 3.6m. This follows the Council's crossover design guidance according to an undisputed assertion by the appellant. This would serve a single width parking space. Whilst the plans show an additional width of hardstand to both sides, this would accommodate bin storage to one side and a pathway aligned with and leading directly to the property's front door to the other. I am not persuaded through any reasoned justification that this arrangement would instead accommodate two parallel parked cars or that use of the parking space would involve any vehicle driving partly over an un-strengthened footway. In my judgement this would be highly unlikely.

8. Although Barn Hill is fairly narrow along the stretch in front of the appeal property, it is clearly marked as single-carriageway width in both directions with central white line markings. In addition, a short stretch of double yellow lines exist along both sides of the road at this point which address the adjacent T-junction where Barn Rise joins Barn Hill. There would be no risk of cars parking immediately nearby on the highway that could hamper safe movement of a vehicle reversing into or out of the proposed space. In any event, other properties along this stretch of Barn Hill, where the carriageway is of an equivalent width, have similar curtilage parking spaces to their frontages with no suggestion their use causes any difficulty, including at No 95, the neighbouring attached property.
9. Although there is a speed hump in front of the appeal site there is no suggestion that its position is unequivocally fixed. Neither is there any policy to support any assertion that this type of street furniture is prohibitive to the formation of a new point of access to a road.
10. The proposed access would be close to the nearby road junction but no closer than many I observed within the surrounding streets where off-street spaces are plentiful, often accessed close to similar T-junctions, and at times involving cars that would need to enter or leave the highway on the junction itself. The nature of the surrounding highway network is one of residential streets with many points of access and slow-moving traffic. I have been provided with no analysis to demonstrate that the existing highway environment is dangerous and neither have I been presented with any records of historic incidents. I observed nothing about the proposed point of access that was unique within its wider setting or which would be overtly hazardous to other road users, including pedestrians.
11. I note the Council is satisfied that the proposal would lead to an improvement of surface water retention over the existing arrangement due to the current level of hardstand in front of No 93.
12. When all of this is considered, I am satisfied that there would be no level of parking provision at No 93 that could reasonably be considered excessive and neither am I able to identify any harm to highway safety. There would therefore be no conflict with BLP Policy DMP1 as far as it relates to access and parking, or with the specific criteria set out within BLP Policies BT2 and BT4, or with LP Policy T6.1.

Character and Appearance

13. The site lies within the Barn Hill CA, an attractive residential suburb of predominantly 1920s development set along tree and grass verge lined roads, often with open and spacious road junctions. The front boundary of the appeal property is marked by a low, sand-faced brick wall behind which the frontage is mostly hard-surface with two circular planted areas, described as 'tree pits', although at the time of my visit I saw no vegetation of any meaningful value other than limited numbers of garden shrubs within isolated pockets.
14. The proposal would involve a new hard surface for the parking space and the residual part of the front garden retained as a soft landscaped area. The *Barn Hill Conservation Area Design Guide* (DG) supports in principle the removal of garden walls and hedges and formation of hard surfaces where they form part of an acceptable off-street parking scheme. Furthermore, in this instance over 50% of the front garden would be retained for soft landscaping, along with the residual length of front garden wall, with an existing brick pier repositioned. These alterations

would accord with the DG advice and I share the Council's view that the proposed changes to the front forecourt would be an improvement over the existing arrangement and a positive enhancement to the character and appearance of the CA.

15. The planning application form describes the proposed materials for the boundary treatment as brickwork to match surroundings. This could reasonably be controlled by requiring the materials for the rebuilt/repared wall to match the existing, which would be necessary in the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area. Materials for the proposed hard surface are described as brick. I observed a mixed palette of materials used for other hard surfaces within the area. Moreover, the pavement in front of the appeal property is a combination of pavers, concrete infill patches and concrete slabs. The use of a brick hardstand would be appropriate within the curtilage of No 93 and within the context of its immediate setting. I see no reason to request any further details for approval by way of condition, as suggested by the Council.
16. The Council is concerned that due to levels changes on the site, there is insufficient information to judge the visual impact of the proposed landscaping. However, I observed that the garden facing Barn Hill and forward of the dwelling's front elevation was relatively level. The levels change principally occurs along the plot's side return to Barn Rise but where no alterations to the existing garden layout are proposed. Although details of the proposed new landscaping are sparse, due to the small scale and private residential context of the front garden I do not consider it reasonable or necessary to seek further details for approval. I am satisfied that a lawn to the front and shrub planting as shown around the perimeter would adequately reflect the established private garden settings of properties within the immediate area and would safeguard the visual qualities of the street scene.
17. Overall, and without the need to seek further details for approval, I am satisfied that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the CA. As such, its significance as a heritage asset would be unaffected. Consequently, there would be no conflict with BLP Policies DMP1 or BHC1 as far as they relate to the impact of development upon the Borough's heritage assets, including their preservation or enhancement.

Other Matters

18. The officer's report and the appeal questionnaire suggest details of a proposed replacement front door to the appeal property should be submitted for further approval. The existing front door is set deep into the site and recessed behind the dwelling's front façade under overhanging roof eaves. I also observed that the property's fenestration is contemporary replacement, along with many others within the street scene. The front entrance door is neither a prominent, nor important feature of the property and plays no part in defining the overall character or appearance of the CA. It would be unreasonable to seek details of its replacement as a condition of planning permission.
19. The proposal includes a light-well in front of the dwelling. I note that planning permission was granted for works which included a front light-well in June 2024 and that that permission remains extant (Ref 24/0861). The Council has stated that the currently proposed light-well would be larger than that last proposed and that it would project deeper than the 800mm stated as normally acceptable within the DG.

Nevertheless, they are satisfied that it would have limited visual impact when viewed from Barn Hill. I agree and am satisfied that it would not impact the character or appearance of the CA.

Conditions

20. In addition to the conditions' discussions above, and the need to control the materials for the front boundary wall changes, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans is also necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Conclusions

21. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR