



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2022

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/22/3283230

10 Clarendon Gardens, Wembley, London, HA9 7QY

- 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 Mrs TT Wu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 21/1788, dated 14 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Extensions and alterations to existing roof, addition of enlarged rear dormer, roof lights and removal of existing chimney to dwellinghouse'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a hip to gable end roof extension with enlargement of dormer window, and two front rooflights to dwellinghouse at 10 Clarendon Gardens, Wembley, London, HA9 7QY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/1788, dated 14 May 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: CG101; CG301; CG302; CG303; CG303l; roof sketch.
 - 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. 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 policy DMP1 in the Development Management Policy document referred to in the Council's decision with LP policy DMP1. Both parties have had the opportunity to comment on this and I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. The Council's decision notice describes the development as a 'Hip to gable end roof extension with enlargement of dormer window, and two front rooflights to dwellinghouse' and as this describes the proposal as shown in the plans more

accurately I have considered the appeal on this basis and have included that description in the formal decision.

Reasons

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. Development plan policy in the new LP, policy DMP1, seeks to ensure that all development is of a high quality that complements the locality. The guidance in the Council's 'Residential Extensions and Alterations' Supplementary Planning Document 2 (2018) (SPD2) advises that roof alterations should complement the home and the street's original character.
5. This semi-detached dwelling and its neighbour form one of four similar pairs built during the inter-war period in a prominent position around a small roundabout in this residential area. They were built in a distinctive mock-Tudor style to a symmetrical design comprising a main hipped roof with subsidiary gables, half-timbered and rendered, that project from the corners. Despite some changes to this pair in particular, they remain a broadly coherent and attractive group which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the street scene and the area.
6. The appeal dwelling has an approved existing, large two storey side extension that was built some years ago with a gabled roof and was clearly designed in a style to reflect that of the original projection. However, its greater width and shallower pitch has resulted in an overly dominant element that has unbalanced the symmetry of the pair when seen from the street. The adjoining property has a lawful large rear dormer, an extended main ridgeline and a change from the original hip to a partial gable end roof that also unbalances the symmetry of the pair.
7. This proposal seeks to reinstate some of that symmetry. The Council has not raised any objection to the enlargement of an existing rear dormer and as this would reflect that of the adjoining dwelling and would be set down sufficiently from the main ridgeline, it would reintroduce some symmetry to the rear elevation and would be acceptable.
8. The extension of the main ridgeline and alteration of the main hipped roof to a partial gable end roof with a hipped section at the top would also reflect the roof of the adjoining semi and would reinstate some symmetry to the front elevation. The Council's contention that the existing extension has hipped roof forms is incorrect as the plans show, and my site visit confirmed, that it has a gabled roof with a small flat roof section on top. As that extension does not contribute positively to the character and appearance of the dwelling and was approved before the adoption of SPD2, it would not be appropriate to require that this proposal matches its roof. In any case, the proposed hipped section would reflect the form of the main roof and the proposed gable end element would not be prominent in the street scene as it would be partially screened by the existing chimney and side extension. In the context of the existing extension, these changes would not be significant and would complement both the dwelling and the original character of the street.
9. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the dwelling or the area and would accord with both LP policy DPM1 and the guidance in SPD2.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in order to provide certainty. A condition requiring matching external materials is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons stated above, I conclude that the proposed development would accord with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh this. The appeal should be allowed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector