
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 July 2024

by V Goldberg BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/23/3333572

189A High Road, Brent, London NW10 2SD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Monarch Concept Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 23/2612.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a mansard roof extension to the first and second floor maisonette.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue relevant to this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a first and second floor maisonette within a three-storey red brick Victorian building. The site is located on the commercial High Road, which is predominantly characterised by red brick buildings with pitched roofs.
4. At roof level, the building has a pitched roof with a decorative gable end fronting the High Road, a large ornate chimney facing Hawthorn Road and a chimney positioned to the rear. The pitched roof is largely hidden behind the gable end and ornate chimney which positively contribute to the street scene and are particularly prominent due to the sloping profile of the roof and the corner position of the site.
5. The introduction of a mansard roof would introduce an unacceptable bulk and mass at roof level, creating an additional storey, that would fail to be subservient to the host property and appear visually dominant in the street scene. The multiple dormers punctuating the side elevation fail to complement or respect the architectural details of the building and the additional height would be at odds with the prevailing character of the comparable properties on the road. Given the prominent position of the property, the incongruous nature of the proposed development would be visible from multiple vantage points and would therefore negatively affect the established character of the street scene.
6. The appeal scheme retains the front gable end, parapet wall and flank chimney. However, the design of the mansard, removes one of the chimneys

and reduces the prominence of the decorative architectural features, thereby failing to respect the architectural form of the property.

7. Whilst the building is neither listed nor within a conservation area, due to its architectural form, the building has a distinctive character, and the Framework, Policy DMP 1 of the Brent Plan and Policy SPD2 of the Residential Extension Design Guide require good design, that complements the locality and property. The proposal fails to achieve these aims.
8. Reference is made to the taller adjoining property to the east. This building is a modern standalone development, and its form, proportions and style are not comparable to the appeal site. Increasing the height of the appeal site to align with this property would be detrimental to the traditional form and character of the building.
9. My attention has been drawn to four storey buildings and roof extensions on the High Road. Although four storey buildings and mansard roofs may exist in the road, they are the exception rather than the norm, especially in the context of the older and more traditional buildings. Moreover, the images provided do not appear directly comparable in respect of the form of the host building or its corner position and I do not know the planning circumstances of the examples given. As a result, the appeal scheme would fail to be sympathetic to the prevailing character and appearance of the townscape.
10. For the reasons identified above, I conclude that the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan 2019- 2041 and Policy SPD2- Residential Extensions Guide (2018) and the Framework, in so far as they require development to complement the property and street character.

Conclusion

11. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and the material considerations before me do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

V Goldberg

INSPECTOR