



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2020

by **Peter D Biggers** BSc Hons MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/20/3257035

17 The Paddocks, Wembley HA9 9HB.

- 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 Mr Moiz Kadar against the decision of the London Borough of Brent Council.
 - The application Ref 20/1001, dated 25 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is extension of the existing loft at the rear and the introduction of 2 rooflights in the rear roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extension of the existing loft at the rear and the introduction of 2 rooflights in the rear roof slope at 17 The Paddocks, Wembley HA9 9HB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/1001, dated 25 March 2020, and subject to the following conditions :
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of approval.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: TPDK/RE/03; TPDK/RE/13; TPDK/RE/14; TPDK/RE/15; TPDK/RE/16; TPDK/RE/17; TPDK/RE/18; TPDK/RE/19; TPDK/RE/20; TPDK/RE/21.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The Paddocks, where the appeal site is located, is a mainly residential road of large detached houses built of brick and tile and standing in large plots. No 17 has had the benefit of previous extensions and also has an extant permission for ground and first floor rear extension and a first floor side extension (Refs 19/1594 and 19/3916).
 4. This appeal proposal would rework the permitted first floor extension and extend the loft space under an enlarged crown roof. The previously permitted extension (Ref 19/1594) involved the addition of a rear facing hipped roof extension
-

matching the already existing offshoot to the rear leaving a flat roofed valley section between the two offshoots. The appeal proposal would infill the valley by combining these two offshoots into one single roof slope involving a larger crown roof area.

5. The property already has a part crown roof which, whilst not the prevailing roof form in the area, (which is typically pitched), nevertheless is not apparent when viewed from street level.
6. The increased depth of roof extending over the roof terrace would be visible in oblique views through the gap between Nos 19 and 17 The Paddocks approaching from the north. However, this side roof slope to the extension already has permission and could be built out and the appeal proposal would involve no additional increase in depth. From the south on The Paddocks no part of the extension would be visible behind the existing side roof. Therefore, from the public domain on The Paddocks the proposal would not have any greater impact than that already permitted on the character and appearance of the street.
7. In the rear, the proposal would result in the main roof of No 17 having a greater depth than its neighbours. However, as stated, the property already has an existing and permitted rear offshoot to the roof to the same depth as would be the case from the appeal proposal and the extension would result in a single pitch form similar to that on the neighbouring properties. The garden plots to properties on The Paddocks are large with strongly landscaped boundaries which would reduce the impact of the additional depth viewed from neighbouring gardens. In any event from ground level it would be difficult to observe any significant difference in appearance between a traditional pitched roof and a crown roof.
8. I acknowledge that there would be the possibility of inward views from upper windows of the properties on The Mount to the east in which the enlarged crown roof might be visible, particularly in winter when trees are bare, however the nearest properties are about 40 metres away. Therefore, the additional impact of the proposed development infilling the central section between the existing and already permitted hipped rear offshoots, would be minimal and would not justify dismissal of the appeal.
9. I acknowledge that whilst the additional extent of the appeal proposal itself is modest, cumulatively the property has seen significant extension. Nevertheless, the property is substantial and overall the impact of the scale of change on its character and appearance would not be unacceptable.
10. In this case and for the reasons above the proposed roof extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the property or its surroundings and would comply with Policy DMP1 of the *Brent Local Plan Development Management Policies* which requires development to complement the locality through its design. It also would comply with the aspiration of Policy BD1 of the emerging *Brent Local Plan* which seeks a high standard of urban design.
11. The Council has prepared the *Brent Design Guide - SPD1* to assist in ensuring design aspirations are met and in respect of roofscape it states that building roofs should be designed to minimise the impact of height and positively respond to the character of the area. The Council has also produced *Residential Extensions and Alterations - SPD2* to guide the design of extensions and in respect of roof extensions states that roof form is a significant part of an area's character and alterations to a roof should be designed to complement the original building and

the street character. For the reasons above and, given the particular context of No 17 and the permissions already granted, the increased depth of the crown roof would not conflict with this guidance.

Conditions and Conclusion

12. The Council suggested basic conditions, which I have considered in the light of the advice in the Framework and *Planning Practice Guidance*. A condition requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans is necessary in the interest of certainty. Control of the materials to be used on the exterior of the extension is also necessary to ensure the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings is not harmed.
13. I have considered the matters before me and for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and permission granted for the extension subject to the conditions set out above.

P. D. Biggers

INSPECTOR