



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 May 2025

by N Armstrong BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/25/3359586

Fadak House, 13 Hollycroft Avenue, Wembley, Brent HA9 8LG

- 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 Munked Al-Haddad against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 24/1358.
 - The development proposed is first floor extensions and roof alterations to Nr 13 Hollycroft Avenue, Wembley, Greater London, HA9 8LG to create additional first floor living space for Flat 2 and the provision of a studio flat (Flat 3) within the roof space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The decision notice has three reasons for refusal, which relate separately to the proposed side extensions, the crown roof design and the rear dormer, and refers to the effects on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the area. The Brent Residential Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document January 2025 (the SPD) was adopted on the 16 January 2025. The Council states this now supersedes the previous Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2018), which is referred to in the officer report and decision notice.
3. The Council states that had the SPD been adopted at the time the application was considered and determined, the proposed side extensions and rear dormer would have been considered acceptable. I find no reason to disagree. However, the Council states that the second reason for refusal relating to the proposed roof form remains relevant. On this basis, the focus of this appeal is therefore the proposed crown roof design referred to in reason for refusal 2 of the decision notice.
4. I note that the appellant's Planning Statement (page 10) submitted with the application and their appeal statement (page 7) include extracts of plans showing proposed development that differ in the roof design from the plans that were considered by the Council. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the plans showing the crown roof design as considered by the Council.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, with particular reference to the crown roof design.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is a detached, two storey property located within an established residential area. Hollycroft Avenue features a mix of predominantly detached and semi-detached two storey properties. There are variations in the layout and design of properties in the area, including the extent and appearance of extensions and alterations. The appeal property has a dual pitched roof with gable ends over the main two storey section and features bay windows to its frontage with pitched roof features over these. It has been previously extended and features single storey flat roof additions, as well as a pitched roof to one side and a two storey hipped roof addition to the rear.
7. The property has previously been subdivided for use as flats and the proposal would allow for extensions and alterations to create additional floor area and a third flat within the roof space. The development proposes the raising of the main ridge height, roof alterations, side extensions and a rear dormer addition. The development would significantly alter the original pitched roof form of the property, and the side extensions would also incorporate the proposed crown roof design.
8. The proposed design of the main roof and the roofs of the side extensions would be substantial alterations to the property. Whilst the pitch of the roofs may appear similar to the original roof design when viewed from the front, due to the position and layout of the property, the scale and design of the crown roof form would be notable in views from the sides. Despite some subservience with the side extensions and use of matching materials, the overall proposal would result in incongruous and 'top-heavy' additions that would be out of scale and character with the existing property and would have a detrimental visual impact in the immediate area. The development would be clearly visible from the road and footpaths and would adversely impact on the street scene in this part of the estate.
9. I have had regard to the current SPD, which advises that the roof design of homes is a significant part of an area's character, and any roof extensions or alterations should complement the roof of the property. For two storey side extensions, the SPD states that the roof design and pitch should match the roof of the original home and must not have a flat roof unless this matches the original roof. Whilst the SPD does not specifically preclude crown roof designs, for the reasons set out above, the proposal would not complement the original roof form of the property.
10. The appellant has directed me to examples of extensions and alterations within the immediate area on Hollycroft Avenue and Forty Avenue, which I observed as far as I was able to from public views. Whilst I note variations in the appearance of properties and extensions, these do not appear to have completely altered the original roof form of the properties. With regard to 17 Hollycroft Avenue, the extension referred to is also in a much less prominent position in the street scene compared to the appeal site. Some of the flat roof dormer additions also appear out of scale and character with the original properties, therefore it is important to ensure that proposed development is sympathetic to local character and complements the locality.
11. I also do not know all of the circumstances under which other development has taken place or their status with regard to planning permission. Whilst recognising the importance of consistency in decision making, I cannot draw any direct

comparison from these with the proposal that would weigh in its favour. The presence of these does not justify the harm that I have otherwise found.

12. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, with particular reference to the crown roof design. It would therefore conflict with Policy DMP1 of the London Borough of Brent, Brent Local Plan 2019-2041. Amongst other things, this aims to ensure that development will be acceptable provided it is of a scale, type, detailing and design that complements the locality. The proposal also conflicts with the SPD for the reasons set out above.

Other Matters

13. I have had regard to the appellant's evidence, which sets out the aims for additional space, that the proposal would increase housing provision in the area and promote the effective use of land. I also acknowledge the comments that the appeal property is not in an area with designated heritage assets or covered by other designations. However, these matters or any other raised, do not outweigh the harm I have identified or alter my conclusion on the main issue.
14. Where the proposal has been found to be acceptable in other respects, for example in terms of location, the subdivision for use as flats, space standards, living conditions of residents and highway safety, these are neutral matters and do not weigh in favour of the development.

Conclusion

15. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Armstrong

INSPECTOR