



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2024

by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/23/3322411

67B Wrotesley Road, Brent, London NW10 5UL

- 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 Arulkumar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 22/3522, dated 30 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is hip to gable end roof and rear dormer roof extensions with 1x front rooflight, 1x side window and raised party wall to first floor flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development above is taken from the planning decision notice and appeal form as this is a more succinct description than that provided in the planning application form.
3. The Government published on 19 December 2023 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Whilst this made certain revisions to aspects of national planning policy, the provisions in respect of the main issue in this case are largely unchanged. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework from the parties, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. This appeal concerns a first floor flat within a semi-detached building which occupies a corner plot within a predominantly residential area. Permission is sought for various roof alterations to provide additional living accommodation.
6. To the rear, part of the host roof would be altered to reflect a mansard design. From this, a dormer extension is also proposed. The proposed mansard and dormer may, individually, be of modest widths. However, their collective massing would dominate the rear roof slope and read as a top-heavy addition to the host dwelling.
7. Further, the proposed varying roof slopes would result in an awkward interaction between the existing roof of the main dwelling and its outrigger.

The resultant proportions and appearance of this part of the extension would be visually unattractive and a contrived design, thus it would fail to harmonise or integrate successfully with the property. All in all, the proposal would be an overly dominant and poor-quality addition to the host property.

8. Given the corner positioning of the property in the street scene, the rear of the building is visible from public vantage points thus the proposed incongruous alterations would be readily apparent. The existing hipped roof of the outrigger would fail to screen the proposal.
9. I appreciate that rear dormers are prevalent features in this locality. Of particular relevance are the existing dormers and roof alterations at the attached property, 65 Wrotesley Road. However, the dormers are box-shaped, noticeably smaller than the appeal proposal and do not dominate the roofscape.
10. Given the traditional mansard proposed and the overall design approach to the rear alterations, the appeal proposal would be a stark addition which would not reflect the adjacent additions and would fail to present as a typical roof alteration which one would come to expect in this locality. It would be noticeably at odds with the roof form and overall design of the host property and those in the wider area.
11. Taking all the above into consideration, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area and thus conflicts with policies DMP1 and BD1 of the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 (February 2022) which aim for developments of a high-quality design that complements the locality.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would provide additional living space for occupiers. The desire to extend one's home rather than move is appreciated however this is a private benefit which does not weigh in favour of the proposed development.
13. It has also been suggested that the proposal would result in significant improvements to living conditions within the host property and would result in overall improvements and investments in the appearance and long-term use of the building. There is no conclusive evidence that the property does not currently provide adequate living conditions, nor am I convinced that the proposal is necessary for the upkeep and continued use of the property.
14. The proposal therefore conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations which indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should not succeed.

H Ellison
INSPECTOR