



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2022

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/22/3306110

30 Manor Drive, Wembley, Brent HA9 8ED

- 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 Wright (Baron Properties London Limited) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 22/2076, dated 8 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is alterations to the front roof slope of the existing side extension and the enlargement of the existing rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to the front roof slope of the existing side extension and the enlargement of the existing rear dormer at 30 Manor Drive, Wembley, Brent HA9 8ED in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/2076, dated 8 June 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan, block plan and drawing nos. 331-01, 331-02, 331-03, 331-04, 331-05, 331-06, 331-07 Rev A, 331-08 Rev A, 331-09 Rev A, 331-10 Rev A, 331-11 Rev A and 331-12.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. Amongst other things, the Brent Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2 (Jan 2018) ('SPD') sets out that two storey side extensions should be of a size, shape and height that complement rather than dominate your house. It continues that side extensions should normally be no wider than two thirds of the width of the original house, and should be set-in and set-back from the front wall of the house, and with the roof set down, in order to ensure a suitably subservient appearance.

4. The properties in Manor Drive are mostly two storey, semi-detached and in a similar style, and are laid out with their front faces orientated parallel to the road. However, just south of Hillcroft Crescent is a small group of fairly diverse single storey properties, which includes the appeal site. The host forms one half of a semi-detached pair, which is set at an angle to that junction, and which has a single storey form, albeit with accommodation in the roofspace.
5. The host has been previously extended to the side. Whilst the main part of the extension's roof matches the form, materials and pitch of the remainder of the building, and it is set down from its ridge, it also has a somewhat incongruous front-facing, flat-roofed, section.
6. As a result of this scheme, the front wall of the extension would still be set back slightly from the original building's front face, but its ridge would not be set down. In that regard the scheme would not appear fully subservient to the original building, but neither would it dominate it. Moreover, it would be faced in matching materials, it would have a matching roof pitch, and given that the flat-roofed part of the building would be subsumed into the extension, the resultant building's form would be more coherent than at present.
7. The other half of this pair, and the pair of dwellings immediately to the south, are similar in style to the host, and each has a single dormer to the front. However, I observed few other similar buildings in the area. The proposed second front dormer here would be set up from the eaves and well down from the ridge. It would align with the window in the floor beneath, and it would reflect the style and appearance of the host's existing front dormer, but would be significantly smaller than it. Consequently, it would not appear markedly out of place in the streetscene.
8. The Council raises no objection to the enlargement of the rear dormer. Given its unobtrusive siting, and its matching form and materials, neither do I.
9. For the above reasons, whilst the scheme would not fully comply with the advice in the SPD, it would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area. Consequently, it would not conflict with Brent Local Plan 2019 - 2041 (2022) Policy DMP1 which, amongst other things, requires the scale, materials, detailing and design of development to provide a high level of external amenity and to complement the locality.
10. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have imposed the standard time limit condition and, in the interests of certainty, a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Additionally, in the interests of good design, a matching materials condition is necessary.
11. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR