



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 August 2022

by H Wilkinson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/22/3291057

159 College Road, London, NW10 5HB

- 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 Ms Adrienne Lamb against the decision of London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 21/3990, dated 6 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as minor amendments to a previously approved planning permission. The first proposed change is to add a further small window to the side (North) elevation to allow more light to penetrate into the interior space. The second change is in regard to the approved dormer design. It proposes to change the finish from matching roof tile for timber screen cladding and adding a slight angle to the facade.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council adopted the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 (LP) on 24 February 2022 and, in an email dated 8 August 2022, they confirmed that the Brent Development Management Policies Plan (2016), referenced within the decision notice, has been revoked. The Council has confirmed that the policies now relevant to this appeal are DMP1 and BD1 of the Brent LP. The appellant has been given an opportunity to comment on the aforementioned policies, against which I have assessed the scheme.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, with particular regard to the cladding of the dormer window in timber.

Reasons

4. The appeal property lies within a terrace comprising of two storey, red brick/rendered dwellings under a tiled roof and occupies a prominent, corner location. Rear elevation dormers are common within the surrounding area, and whilst the form and external facing materials vary, the development pattern is such that the materials generally match the host property. This commonality positively contributes to the suburban character and appearance of the area.
5. Given the extant planning permission for a dormer window of a similar size and position on the site, the general form of the proposed dormer is not disputed. The proposed dormer, however, would be finished in timber rather than matching materials as per the approved dormer plan. The proposed timber cladding would fail

to assimilate with the red tiled roof of the host building and therefore the dormer would read as an incongruous feature, the harm compounded by the property's prominent location and the elevated position of the dormer. Whilst the colour finish of the timber cladding could be secured by condition and high quality materials would be used, this would not prevent the proposed timber clad dormer from reading as an incongruous addition.

6. The use of varied materials, specifically the external finish of College Green Nursery and 72 Hardinge Road have been identified by the appellant, both of which I observed on my site visit. Mention is also made of 125 All Souls Avenue. However, given its distance from the appeal site, it is not within the immediate context of the proposed development and therefore does not form part of the character and appearance of the locality. Accordingly, I give this example limited weight in my considerations.
7. College Green Nursery is a single storey building, located opposite the appeal site, part of which is clad in timber larch. Given the low profile of the building, the cladding integrates with its surroundings and does not appear as a prominent or intrusive feature. Furthermore, as the timber is the main material on the part of the building concerned, the visual contrast is lessened. This, therefore, does not compare with the appeal proposal. Turning to 72 Hardinge Road, the Council's evidence indicates that the development was not completed in accordance with the approved plans which stipulated the use of matching materials. The presence of cladding on that building does not therefore indicate that the appeal proposal is acceptable. Irrespective of this, its dark grey cladding better matches the roof material and therefore, differs to the appeal proposal.
8. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area, with particular regard to the cladding of the dormer window in timber. I therefore find that it conflicts with policies DMP1 and BD1 of the Brent LP which, amongst other aspects seek to ensure that proposals respect and compliment the locality. The proposal would also be inconsistent with the Council's SPD 2 Residential Extensions and Alterations which seeks to ensure roof extensions complement existing properties together with the character of the street.

Other Matters

9. The appeal proposal as described by the appellant also includes the provision of an additional opening on the first floor. The Council's decision notice and delegated report raise no concern in respect of this. However, given the harm identified above, the acceptability of this element does not lead me to a different conclusion.
10. Whilst it may be the case that no third party objections were received by the Council, the lack of objection does not indicate that the development is acceptable. I am also obliged to assess the proposal in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

11. In concluding this appeal, for the reasons outlined above, I find harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area contrary to policies DMP1 and BD1 of the Brent Local Plan. Therefore, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

H Wilkinson

INSPECTOR