



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2021 by C Glaister BSc (Hons)

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/21/3272116

18 Chaplin Road, Wembley HA0 4TY

- 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 Ijaz Qureshi against the decision of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 21/0007, dated 3 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'the loft of the house will be converted to be habitable. Also, it will be extended to the rear of the house and over the double storey outrigger'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The development proposed consists of two rooflights at the front of the property, and a roof extension at the back which extends over the existing rear outrigger. The Council is clear that the two rooflights are minor alterations which would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the area. There is no reason to disagree with the Council on this matter. The same view is therefore taken in this recommendation, and the report will therefore focus on the proposal as it relates to the development at the rear of the property.
4. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework. Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy as a material consideration in my decision-making, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the roof extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The site forms one half of a two-storey semi-detached pair of houses. There is another building to the east before the row of properties along this side of Chaplin Road is interrupted by Ranelagh Road. There are several more dwellings to the west which extend to the southern junction of Napier Road. The area around the site is residential. Properties along Chaplin Road are of a distinct character, with most having bay windows on the first and second storey. Dwellings in the area can be seen to use various external finishes such as brick, paint, and render.
7. 20 Chaplin Road is directly adjacent to the appeal property, and has a flat roof dormer on its main rear roof slope. 43 and 53 Chaplin Road have similar dormers to No 20. 46 Chaplin Road has a large volume of development on its rear roof space, and this is visible from Talbot Road.
8. The roof at the rear on the main area of the building slopes northward. There is a narrower two-storey element of the property at the back with a mono-pitched roof which slopes eastward. The development proposed would create a third storey of habitable space above the two-storey outrigger. It would eliminate the eastward sloping roof and replace it with one that is flat. The other portion of the rear development would occupy the rear roof slope on the main part of the building. Although a small proportion of the roof towards the ridge would remain unaffected, the majority of the northward sloping roof would also be replaced by a flat roof at a greater height. The rear extension as a whole would represent a large box-like addition to the rear, and would completely transform the existing character of the roof. It would be clearly visible from Ranelagh Road, and very slight views of some parts of the rear development would be possible from Napier Road.
9. Due to its size and design, the roof extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would represent a substantial overdevelopment of the building and appear incongruous within its setting. It would be unsympathetic to the current form and character of the dwelling and those around it.
10. The supplementary planning document Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD 2 (Jan 2018) (SPD2) encourages rear dormer windows to be set 0.5m above the eaves. It also notes that dormers that project onto a rear projection will not normally be permitted. The roof extension would not adhere to these aspects of SPD2.
11. I recognise that the appeal site is not subject to any additional constraints, such as being within a conservation area, and that the development must conform with the development plan. Being in conformance with permitted development rights where they relate to a dormers height above the eaves holds very little weight. Though the extension would be set down lower from the ridge than what is recommended in SPD2, this does not mitigate the harm that would arise. Similarly, even if the extension would appear distinguishable from the original dwelling, this would not mitigate the harm.

12. The appeal is considered with respect to its own individual merits. The dormers at Nos 20, 53, and 43 are dissimilar to what is proposed. They do not extend over the rear outrigger, and as such, have a lesser overall scale and impact. The development at No 46 bears a greater resemblance to the appeal proposal. However, the Council have stated that this development was allowable under permitted development rights. None of the development in the area would justify the roof extension, or mitigate the harm that has been identified.
13. Whilst I would agree with the conclusion that the proposed rooflights would be acceptable in design terms, for the above reasons, the roof extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and the surrounding area. It would therefore fail to comply with Policy CP17 of the London Borough of Brent Local Development Framework Core Strategy (July 2010) and Policy DMP1 of the Brent Development Management Policies (November 2016) which together seek to protect the distinctive suburban character of Brent and ensure development is designed to complement the locality.

Other Matters

14. The appellant has suggested that the total volume of the roof would not excessively exceed what would be allowable under permitted development rights. However, taking the appellant's contention at face value, the rear extension would nonetheless exceed what would be permitted, and as such, a permitted scheme would have a lesser impact than the scheme as proposed. I am also mindful that there is no evidence before me that the appellant has established a formal fallback position regarding the extent of any scheme which could be completed as permitted development, and I therefore attach very limited weight to this contention.
15. Compliance with the Policy where it relates to living conditions is a neutral matter and does not weigh in support of the development. The sum of the weight given to all material considerations would not outweigh the harm that would be caused by the roof extension.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Glaister

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR