



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2022

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/22/3290558

113 Tokyngton Avenue, Wembley, London, HA9 6HA

- 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 P Logan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 21/3802, dated 7 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Retention of first floor rear extension and alterations to roofs'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The development plan includes the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 (LP) which was adopted on 24 February 2022 after the date of the Council's decision for this case and has replaced the policy referred to in the Council's decision. Both parties have had the opportunity to comment on this and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Reasons

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. LP policy DMP1 seeks to ensure that all development has, amongst other things, a siting, scale and design that complements the locality.
4. The appeal site comprises an end terrace dwelling built in the 1950's in a residential area of similar properties. The terraces were built with main hipped roofs and whilst some have been altered and extended, in general there are gaps at first floor and roof level that maintain a sense of space between terraces and this contributes positively to the area's character and appearance.
5. No 113 has a long planning history that includes the approval of several extensions. The property comprises extensions to all elevations and a mix of roof forms which appear somewhat disjointed and complicated. These include a main gabled roof with a large flat roof dormer, a two storey side and rear extension with a hipped roof as well as front and rear single storey extensions with hipped and lean-to roof forms. I have noted that the first floor rear extension that forms part of this proposal has already been built.

6. The proposed change of the existing hipped roof over the two storey side extension to a gabled roof has already been approved under another scheme (19/0343) and would have a set down of 0.7m from the main ridge. As such, it would appear subservient to the main part of the dwelling. It would also improve the appearance of the dwelling on the front and side elevations by integrating that element with the main roof which has already been changed from a hipped to a gabled roof (which the Council says was considered lawful under a previous appeal decision). The Council has not objected to that part of the scheme and for the reasons given, I also find that it would be acceptable.
7. Neither has the Council objected to the proposed change to the roof of the single storey rear extension and as it would form only a small element, I have no concerns in that regard.
8. With regard to the proposed first floor rear extension, I have noted that permission for a smaller first floor extension with a hipped roof was granted in 2019. The extension that has been built is significantly wider than the approved scheme and unlike that scheme, is connected to the large dormer in the rear roof slope. The guidance in the Council's 'Residential Extensions and Alterations' Supplementary Planning Document 2 (2018) (SPD) advises that it is often not possible to erect a two storey rear extension where there is an existing rear dormer window as this can result in an unacceptable design.
9. Although that extension is sited on the rear elevation and the connection of the ridge to the rear dormer would not be seen from the street, its side elevation can be clearly seen from there and the proposed change from a hipped to a gabled roof would introduce additional bulk. When seen from the street, together with the main roof, the side extension and the dormer, it would appear excessively bulky and would reduce the sense of space at roof level between this and the adjacent terrace, thereby detracting from the street scene. Furthermore, its width across more than half of the rear elevation and its siting in close proximity to the rear dormer would result in an overly dominant extension when seen from the rear and it would not appear subordinate to the main part of the dwelling.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons stated above, I conclude that the proposed development, by reason of the siting, width and roof form of the first floor rear extension, would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of both the dwelling and the area. As such, it would be contrary to the development plan policy referred to earlier and there are no material considerations that would outweigh this conflict. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector