
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2022

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/21/3287054

22 Stancroft, London NW9 0SJ

- 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 V Coroama against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 21/2798, dated 20 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a double-storey side extension, a loft conversion, a single-storey rear, external steps to the rear extension and an outbuilding/garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of the erection of a double-storey side extension, a loft conversion, a single-storey rear, external steps to the rear extension and an outbuilding/garage at 22 Stancroft, London NW9 0SJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/2798, dated 20 July 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drg Nos SB20/S/001 Rev 01, SB20/S/002 Rev 01, SB20/S/005 Rev 1 – Proposed Outbuilding Elevations, SB20/S/09 AR 00HS DR Rev B, SB20/S/10 AR 00HS DR Rev B, SB20/S/003 Rev 01, SB20/S/004 Rev 01, SB20/S/005 Rev 1 – Existing Elevations, SB20/S/005 Rev 1 – Proposed Floor Plans, SB20/S/005 Rev 01 – Proposed Roof and Loft Plans, SB20/S/005 Rev 2 – Proposed Elevations, Arbtech AIA 01, and Arbtech TPP 01.
 - 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.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the date of the decision the Council has adopted the *Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 February 2022* (BLP). The *Brent Development Management Policies Plan 2016* has been revoked and its Policy DMP1, as referred to in the Council's reason for refusal, is no longer relevant. The Council has advised that BLP Policy DMP1 is now relevant and supports their decision. The appellant was invited to comment.

Main Issue

3. The Council has not raised any concern with regard to the proposed outbuilding/garage. I have no reason to disagree and am satisfied that it would be a modest building in its garden setting, appropriately residential in scale without any harmful impact upon the character or appearance of the area or the living conditions of any surrounding occupiers. The main issue is therefore the effect of the proposed extensions to the house upon the character and appearance of 22 Stancroft and the wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling within a wider residential area comprising houses of broadly similar age and style. It is one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings that sit at the terminal end of a short cul-de-sac and occupies a corner location on a triangular shaped plot which fans out to the rear. The proposed extensions would involve a hip to gable change to the existing roof, a 'box-like' dormer to the rear, a two-storey side addition and a single-storey addition to the rear.
5. The Council is satisfied that the proposed hip to gable alteration and rear roof dormer would comply with their guidance for such development as contained within their adopted *Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD 2 – Jan 2018*. I have no reason to disagree. They also point to the number of other hip to gable changes in the area on similar properties, which I saw for myself.
6. The Council is also satisfied that the single-storey rear extension would accord with the SPD's guidance for such development. Once again, I have no reason to disagree. The extension would be modest in depth and well related to the host dwelling.
7. The two-storey side extension would have a staggered side elevation due to the angled boundary of the plot and maintenance of access to the rear garage. It would have a hipped roof. The SPD advises that for two-storey side extensions the roof should match the pitch angle and materials used on the main roof of the house and that the extension should have a hipped side roof plane where the existing roof is hipped to the side, and a gable end where it is gabled. The side extension would not comply with the guidance in this regard. However, the side extension would be deeply recessed behind the dwelling's front elevation. As such, and due also to the site's corner location and the juxtaposition between the appeal property and the neighbouring property at No 20, which is a significant consideration in this case, the side addition would be largely tucked away from open sight. I therefore do not agree with the Council's assertion that the proposal would result in works that would appear harmful to the

character or appearance of the house or the wider area. On the contrary, I find it would appear as an inconspicuous and innocuous addition.

8. Overall, for the reasons given, I am satisfied that there would be no conflict with the requirement of BLP Policy DMP1 for development to complement the locality.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition a condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to ensure that the materials used externally match those on the existing building.

Conclusion

10. In the absence of any identified harm and conflict with the development plan, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR