



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2022

by M Ollerenshaw BSc(Hons) MTPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/21/3282679

140 Dollis Hill Lane, London NW2 6HU

- 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 Ali Walji against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 20/4216, dated 21 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed two storey rear/side extension, increase of ridge height with new roof and crown section, 2 dormers to eastern elevation, 1 dormer to western elevation, insertion of 1 x rooflight to front, addition of window to first floor side elevation, conversion of property to 5 self-contained flats with new boundary wall, front landscaping, bin and cycle stores, as well as the retention and alteration of existing outbuilding for use as utility & garden room for Flat 1 only'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Following the refusal of the planning application, the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 (Local Plan) was adopted by the Council in February 2022. This superseded the London Borough of Brent Local Plan Development Management Policies (2016). The main parties have had the opportunity to comment on the relevant policies of the Local Plan and I have had regard to any comments received and to the new Local Plan in my decision.
3. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. However, it does not materially alter the national policy approach in respect of the issues raised in this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a two storey detached dwelling which stands on elevated ground on the northern side of Dollis Hill Lane opposite Gladstone Park. The property is served by a driveway to the front and a garden to the rear, at the end of which is a large outbuilding situated on raised ground. There is a notable slope along Dollis Hill Lane such that the appeal property is on higher ground than Nos 136 and 138 to the west but is lower than the

apartments blocks to the east. The appeal property is also set slightly further forward than Nos 136 and 138.

6. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and is characterised principally by two storey detached and semi-detached properties which feature hipped roofs, front gables and two storey bay windows. They generally sit within relatively large plots and are set back from the road edge behind front gardens and driveways. Together with the mature trees in the park opposite, and shrubs in the front gardens of properties, this positively contributes to a spacious and verdant character to the area.
7. The Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD2 (2018) (SPD) advises that the depth of any two storey rear extension should be restricted to a maximum of 3m, and that the design, shape and materials of the roof must match the original roof.
8. Although the proposed two storey rear extension would project around 2.8m from the existing rearmost first floor rear elevation, it would extend 7.2m from the secondary rear elevation and extend across the full width of the rear elevation. The proposal includes the alteration of the existing hipped roof to a new crown roof which would increase the overall height of the property by about 0.5m.
9. The two storey extension would be a substantial and unduly dominant addition which would conceal much of the original rear elevation of property. Given the substantial size and scale of the two storey extension, and the increased height of the building, the proposal would be excessively bulky and out of proportion to the host property and would fail to be subservient to it.
10. I accept that ridge heights along the north side of Dollis Hill Lane are staggered due to the change in levels, and that the appeal property is lower in height than the apartment blocks to the east. Nevertheless, the property is viewed predominantly alongside Nos 136 and 138 whose ridge heights are already notably lower than the appeal property. Thus the proposed increase in height of the property, though relatively modest, would be accentuated by the change in levels which I consider would result in a discordant relationship between the roof heights of the appeal property and Nos 136 and 138.
11. Although the proposal includes hipped roof elements, the crown roof design would be an uncharacteristic feature which would detract from the original character of the property and sit uncomfortably with its immediate neighbours, which have hipped or pitched roofs. Whilst dormer extensions are not uncommon in the locality, the proposed side dormers would add further bulk to the new roof structure which would add to the cumulative effects of the proposal and exacerbate its adverse visual effects.
12. Whilst the two storey extension would be positioned to the rear of the building, given that it is stepped forward of Nos 136 and 138, the increased scale and massing of the building would still be readily apparent within the street scene, from Rosecroft Gardens and from neighbouring properties.
13. A substantial two storey rear extension has been added to No 136, however it does not extend across the full width of the property and it includes a traditional hipped roof which is set below the main ridge and is read as a

subordinate addition to the property. Therefore, that development is not directly comparable to the appeal proposal.

14. The appellant contends that similar dormers could be erected to the eastern and western roof slopes of the property using permitted development rights. However, two of the dormers proposed could not be erected in the positions shown within the side roof slopes as they currently exist. Therefore, the weight to be attached to the appellant's fallback position is limited and does not outweigh the harm identified above.
15. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. As such, there would be conflict with Policies BD1 and DMP1 of the Local Plan and the SPD which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is of high quality design that complements the locality.

Other Matters

16. The development proposed would offer potential benefits in terms of providing new self-contained flats and would contribute to the housing mix in the area. Economic benefits would arise from construction employment opportunities, Council tax revenue and spending in the local area by future occupants. However, given the modest scale of the development proposed, the weight attributable to these matters is limited and is insufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.

Conclusion

17. For the above reasons, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

M Ollerenshaw

INSPECTOR