
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2025

by **E Heron MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/24/3356209

2A District Road, Wembley, Brent HA0 2LD

- 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 Mr Samji Meghani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application ref is 24/1634.
 - The development proposed is hip to gable end and enlarging loft to first floor flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council has confirmed in its evidence that with the use of appropriate materials, the proposed rear dormer would be acceptable. I see no reason to disagree. Reason for refusal 2 has been withdrawn. I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. During the course of the appeal, the Council adopted the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2025). This supersedes the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD2 (2018). My attention has not been drawn to any elements of relevance to this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed hip to gable alteration on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

Reasons

5. District Road is a residential street of two-storey dwellings, the majority of these are semi-detached, with a regular pattern of gable frontages and a strong building line. The appeal site, its semi-detached neighbour and the property on the junction with Central Road (no 1 District Road) and other details of the houses such as the gables to properties opposite, introduce some variety to the street scene.
6. Due to the setback position of Sudbury Baptist Church and the geometry of the road junction with Central Road, there is spaciousness at the eastern end of District Road such that the end properties, including the appeal building and 1 District Road, are particularly prominent. From this view, whilst there is a striking feature in the form of a corner turret, the hipped roofs on these end properties moderate the bulk of the buildings so that the structures sit comfortably in the street scene and reflect the scale of the domestic buildings within the street. Any

side gables on properties opposite the appeal site are largely hidden from view when approaching the appeal site, due to the small gaps between dwellings.

7. The appeal property differs from its semi-detached neighbour in varying aspects, but in general there is continuity in scale and massing, and a symmetrical hipped roof arrangement. The two-storey side extension on the appeal building does not detract from the cohesive quality of the pairing as it is subservient in all respects, with a hipped roof, mirroring that on the host building.
8. The proposed gable end would adjoin the hipped roof of the two-storey side extension and would be highly visible in the street scene due to the set back position of the church and the geometry of the junction with Central Road. The gable would alter the scale of the building such that it would appear significantly larger, and its form, butted up against the smaller, two storey hipped roof side extension, would create an incongruous addition. As such it would be a dominant feature in the street scene on the approach to the site that would look harmfully out of place.
9. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed hip to gable alteration would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. As such, the development conflicts with Policy DMP1 of the London Borough of Brent, Brent Local Plan 2019-2041, which requires development to complement the locality by way of scale, type and design, amongst other things.

Other Matters

10. It is acknowledged that the proposal would provide an additional bedroom for the household making more efficient use of the site in an accessible location served by public transport, shops, services and a park. These matters do not attract sufficient weight to overcome the visual harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan. There are no material considerations that outweigh this conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

E Heron

INSPECTOR