



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2026

by Stephen Hawkins MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 August 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/C/25/3359098

56 The Ridgeway, London NW9 0UA

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Ms Shumaila Imtiaz Fareed against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The notice was issued on 10 December 2024.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the erection of a part single storey, part two storey rear extension.
 - The requirements of the notice are: 1. Demolish the part single storey, part two storey rear extension. 2. Remove all items and debris, arising from the compliance with step 1, and remove all materials associated with the unauthorised development from the premises.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is three months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed, the enforcement notice is upheld and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

Preliminary Matter

2. My decision takes the revised National Planning Policy Framework, which came into force during the course of the appeal, into account.

Ground (a) appeal

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this ground of appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property contains one of a pair of two-storey, semi-detached dwellings, with balanced front elevations incorporating bay windows and dual pitched, hipped roofs. The ground levels are much lower at the rear of the dwellings compared to in front. Development in the surrounding area generally consists of pairs and terraces of dwellings which exhibit significant similarities in terms of their scale and appearance. These factors assist in furnishing the surroundings with a pleasant and harmonious suburban residential character and appearance.

5. The enforcement notice attacks a part single storey, part two storey extension erected at the rear of the dwelling. The extension spans almost the full width of the dwelling, the two storey part protruding just over 3 metres from the original rear elevation before stepping down to single storey level and protruding around a further 5.5 metres into the rear garden.
6. The extensive overall depth, together with the considerable overall width and height, contribute to the extension having a substantial scale relative to that of the dwelling. The overall depth and stepped, mono pitch roof form give the extension an elongated, box-like profile and a horizontal emphasis, distinctly at odds with the tall rear elevation, hipped roof and more vertical proportions of the dwelling. The sense of uneasiness is increased by the white colour paint finish on the external walls of the extension, which differs noticeably from the darker, more subdued hues in the pebbledash found on the external walls of the dwelling.
7. Due to the above factors, the extension does not sit comfortably in relation to the dwelling and is viewed as an awkward, unsympathetic protuberance from its rear elevation. A planning condition could have been imposed to secure a more appropriate external wall finish. However, that by itself would not be sufficient to integrate the extension with the dwelling in visual terms.
8. The revised Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which was adopted by the Council following the issuing of the notice, recommends that single storey rear extensions to semi-detached dwellings should not exceed a maximum depth of 6 metres. That the maximum depth in the SPD is significantly exceeded reinforces my concerns over the substantial scale of the extension and its unsatisfactory visual relationship with the dwelling.
9. The Council have previously granted planning permission for residential extensions at neighbouring properties where there are similar changes in ground levels at the rear, including at 26 The Ridgeway, in 2021¹. This addition is comparable in terms of its overall height to the extension. However, at around 4 metres in depth this addition protrudes under half as far from the rear elevation and as a result, is appreciably smaller in scale and better integrated visually with the host dwelling. Similar considerations apply in relation to the addition of around 3 metres in depth, permitted at No 44 in 2019.²
10. Additions with an overall depth of 5 metres were permitted at the neighbouring attached dwelling, No 54, in 2016.³ Whilst also similar in overall height to the extension, due to their more restrained depth and consequent scale these additions would have had similar visual attributes to those at Nos 26 and 44. Permitted additions at Nos 58 and 60 also differ significantly from the extension, as they do not protrude nearly so far from the rear elevations and utilise more sympathetic roof forms and external materials. Accordingly, the extension does not compare favourably with permitted additions in the locality in terms of its visual qualities.
11. There are several other additions at the rear of properties in the vicinity, often similar in terms of their overall height to the extension. Although their planning history is uncertain, these developments form part of the built context in which the extension falls to be assessed. Even so, these other additions generally do not

¹ Council Ref: 20/3987

² Council Ref: 19/3177

³ Council Ref: 16/3177

protrude such great distances from the rear elevations compared to the extension, being considerably smaller in scale and better integrated visually with the dwellings as a result.

12. Therefore, the extension is entirely at odds with the general pattern of local development and is viewed as an alien built feature in the environs. Given the differences in relative ground levels, along with intervening built and natural features, there are few public views of the extension from the street and in the wider surroundings. However, the visual consequences of the extension can be experienced from neighbouring residential property. Besides, the existence of limited public views is not a sound reason to permit unacceptable development as this could be repeated, leading to further visual harm.
13. For the reasons set out above, the extension causes unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings. This conflicts with criterion in Policy DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan (BLP), which requires new development to be of a location, use, concentration, siting, layout, scale, type, density, materials, detailing and design that provides high levels of internal and external amenity and complements the locality. It conflicts with BLP Policy BD1, which requires all new development to be of the highest architectural and urban design quality. Further, the extension conflicts with criteria in Policy D3 of the London Plan, which require new development to respond to the existing character of a place, including by respecting, enhancing and utilising the architectural features that contribute towards the local character and to be of high quality, with architecture that pays attention to detail and uses attractive, robust materials which weather and mature well.

Other Matters

14. Consistency in decision making is important for the purpose of securing confidence in the operation of the planning system; like cases should be decided in a like manner. Nevertheless, given the material differences from the additions to other local dwellings, identified above, there is little which would indicate that the Council have been inconsistent by enforcing against the extension.
15. Given my findings on the main issue, set out above, the additional matters raised by an interested party do not warrant further consideration.

Conclusion-Ground (a) appeal

16. The extension causes unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area, in conflict with the Development Plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the Development Plan. Therefore, I conclude that the ground (a) appeal should not succeed.

Ground (g) appeal

17. The ground of appeal is that the period for compliance falls short of what should reasonably be allowed.
18. The works involved in demolishing the extension would be a relatively straightforward task for a suitably skilled small building contractor. Such works would not be particularly extensive nor especially complex and are unlikely to require the use of specialist plant and equipment. In my estimation, the remedial

works would be readily capable of being completed within perhaps a month or so at most. It is unclear why such works would necessitate the preparation of detailed technical drawings or specifications.

19. There are probably a significant number of contractors who would be available to undertake the works, given a reasonable period of notice. There is no firm evidence of customers experiencing lengthy waiting times before contractors can fit building projects into their schedules. The three-month period specified in the notice would thus afford the appellant sufficient time in which to search for and secure the services of a suitable contractor, raise any necessary funding, make arrangements for the works to be undertaken and for those works to be completed, whilst also making any necessary changes to the living accommodation in the dwelling.
20. Therefore, the specified compliance period strikes an appropriate balance between remedying the breach as soon as possible whilst also avoiding, so far as is practicable, imposing a disproportionate burden on the appellant. Extending the compliance period on the other hand would do little more than perpetuate the breach and the associated planning harm. The ground (g) appeal fails.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice and refuse to grant planning permission on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act (as amended).

Stephen Hawkins

INSPECTOR