



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2026

by **D Marley BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/25/3375686

167C Cricklewood Broadway, London NW2 3HY

- 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 Isaac Isaacs against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 25/2429.
 - The development proposed is rear dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the site address used in my decision from the decision notice, as it more accurately describes the site.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the Mapesbury Conservation Area; and
 - whether the proposed development would provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers, with particular regard to internal space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is within the Mapesbury Conservation Area (the 'Conservation Area'). Insofar as is relevant to this appeal, the Conservation Area draws its significance from, amongst other matters, the high architectural quality and detailing of largely unaltered buildings, and in the context of the appeal site, from the rhythm of 2-storey outriggers constructed to the rear of properties along this section of Cricklewood Broadway.
5. The appeal building has a 2-storey outrigger and associated pitched roof to the rear. There is an existing small dormer on the outrigger. Adjoining the appeal site is 165 Cricklewood Broadway (No 165), which has a similar outrigger and includes a dormer that largely extends across the full length of the outrigger. The proposed development would extend the existing dormer at the appeal site such that it would

extend across approximately the full length of the outrigger. The proposed dormer would be fitted with a flat roof.

6. By extending broadly across the full length of the outrigger and largely removing the form of the existing pitched roof, the proposed development would appear as an obtrusive and bulky addition to the existing building. This would conflict with the guidelines set out in the Mapesbury Conservation Area Design Guide (2018), which requires proposals for new dormers to be of sympathetic design to the original building and respect the design of the existing roof.
7. I acknowledge that the proposed development would be more screened from public view when compared to the host building's frontage. Nevertheless, the Mapesbury Conservation Area Boundary Extension Character Appraisal (2024) identifies that the outriggers to the rear of this section of Cricklewood Broadway form an important backstop and juxtaposition to the Mapesbury Estate. Additionally, at my site visit I observed that the existing outrigger is in any event clearly visible from public vantage points, and on the evidence before me would likely also be visible from a number of neighbouring gardens. Given this, the location of the proposals to the rear of the building does not diminish the historic significance of the outrigger. I must consider the effect of the proposal on the significance of the Conservation Area as a whole.
8. I also acknowledge that there is an existing dormer at the appeal site. However, the existing dormer is significantly smaller than the appeal proposal and appears subservient to the outrigger, with the outrigger retaining much of its roof form. Given the oversized nature of the proposed dormer, and resultant alterations to the roof form, the proposal would represent a significant change to the host building, and fundamentally alter the existing rhythm of the outrigger. This would undermine the contribution of the outrigger to the Conservation Area and the street scene. This would be harmful to the character, appearance and significance of the Conservation Area, and this harm would not be overcome by the appellant's proposal to use traditional materials that match the host building.
9. I find the harm to the Conservation Area would be 'less than substantial', and located at the lower end of the spectrum. Under such circumstances, Paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
10. The appellant identifies that the proposed development would result in improved, more sustainable accommodation, would represent an efficient use of space, would enhance the longevity and usability of an existing dwelling, and that works would be carried out using sustainable building practices and materials. Even were I to find these matters to be public benefits, given the scale and extent of development this would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified and the great weight I have given to the heritage asset's conservation.
11. Therefore, the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the Conservation Area. It would thus fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposed development would conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies DMP1 and BHC1 of the Brent Local Plan 2019-41, and Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021. Amongst other matters, these policies require development

proposals to complement the locality, and to seek to avoid harm to and conserve the significance of heritage assets.

Living conditions

12. The existing site includes a studio flat located on the first floor. The proposed development would extend the second floor of the building to facilitate the studio flat becoming a one-bedroom apartment over 2 floors.
13. Policy D6 and the associated Table 3.1 of the London Plan 2021 establish minimum internal space standards for residential development. Whilst the size of the existing studio flat and the size of the proposed one-bedroom apartment would be less than that sought for new dwellings in the London Plan 2021, the policy wording within the London Plan 2021 identifies that these internal space standards apply to new self-contained dwellings.
14. Whilst I have been directed to supporting text within the London Plan 2021 identifying that the internal space standards for new dwellings include proposals for 'conversion', I have not been provided with any definition from the development plan of conversion in the context of Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021. In my judgement, the appeal proposal seeks to extend an existing dwelling to create additional living and sleeping space. This would constitute an extension of an existing dwelling, rather than the conversion of a building or part thereof to create a new dwelling. As such, I find the internal space standards set out in Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021 to be non-determinative to my decision.
15. Given the proposal would extend an existing small apartment, it would provide additional living accommodation for future occupiers. I have been directed to no mechanism that would limit the current studio to a single occupant and therefore the potential for the one-bedroom apartment to be occupied by two individuals would not result in harm when compared to the existing situation.
16. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers, with particular regard to internal space. The proposed development would comply with the relevant provisions of Policy DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 and Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021, insofar as these relate to the requirement for proposals to provide high levels of internal amenity, and provide adequately sized rooms.

Conclusion

17. Whilst the proposed development would not cause harm to living conditions, and may be acceptable with regards fire safety, drainage, flood risk and biodiversity matters, these matters are effectively neutral in the planning balance.
18. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

D Marley

INSPECTOR