



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2025

by Felicity Thompson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/C/23/3336132

54 College Road, Wembley HA9 8RJ

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Vehap Ferati against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The notice was issued on 22 November 2023.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission the erection of a hip to gable end roof extension with rear dormer window and rooflights, and, without planning permission the installation of external insulation to the exterior of the premises.
 - The requirements of the notice are to:
STEP 1 Demolish the unauthorised hip to gable end roof extension and rear dormer window.
STEP 2 Remove all external insulation from the exterior of the premises.
STEP 3 Remove all debris, items, and materials, arising from that demolition and removal works, and remove all materials associated with the unauthorised development from the premises.
STEP 4 Re-instate the premises to its former state before the unauthorised works were carried out. (Photograph attached to enforcement notice of premises prior to works being carried out).
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is six months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a) and (f) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act (as amended), for the erection of a hip to gable end roof extension, rooflights and the installation of external insulation to the exterior of the premises at 54 College Road, Wembley HA9 8RJ, subject to the following condition:

- 1) Unless within two months of the date of this decision a scheme for the painting of the external insulation, is submitted in writing to the local planning authority for approval, and unless the approved scheme is implemented within two months of the local planning authority's approval, the external insulation shall be removed until such time as a scheme is approved and implemented.

If no scheme in accordance with this condition is approved within two months of the date of this decision, the external insulation shall be removed until such time as a scheme approved by the local planning authority is implemented.

Upon implementation of the approved painting specified in this condition, that painting shall thereafter be maintained.

In the event of a legal challenge to this decision, or to a decision made pursuant to the procedure set out in this condition, the operation of the time

limits specified in this condition will be suspended until that legal challenge has been finally determined.

2. The appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld insofar as it relates to the rear dormer window at 54 College Road, Wembley HA9 8RJ and planning permission is refused for the dormer window on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act (as amended).

Preliminary Matters

3. I have been appointed to determine three other appeals at the appeal property, references APP/T5150/C/23/3336131/3336133/3336134. Those appeals are the subject of separate decisions.
4. Since the appeal was made the Council have adopted the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document January 2025 (SPD) which the appellant provided, and I have had regard to.

The appeal on ground (a) the deemed planning application

Main issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the hip to gable end roof extension, rear dormer window, rooflights and external insulation on the character and appearance of the property and area generally.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace dwellinghouse located in a predominantly residential area, which generally consists of rows of terraces and pairs of semi-detached houses. Houses in the locality have been altered and extended but there remains a degree of harmony in respect of materials and design features to the front elevations, with brick and light painted render being the predominant finishes. Two storey bay windows clad with hanging tiles are characteristic of the houses in this and surrounding terraces.
7. Hipped roofs are characteristic, particularly noticeable in the pairs of semi-detached houses. However, I saw that a number of hip to gable roof extensions have been carried out along the road, and rooflights have been installed in some front roof slopes.
8. In this case the hip to gable extension follows the existing and that of the neighbouring 56 College Road ridgeline and roof plane, and in this context, particularly given the end of terrace position, I find that the hip to gable extension and rooflights cause no harm to the character and appearance of the property and area generally.
9. I saw that other houses in the road and immediate vicinity have been rendered, and in a small number of cases, clad with materials which are unsympathetic to the general palette of materials. The external insulation has the appearance of render and although it stands proud of the external walls, that is by a relatively minimal amount, which is unlikely to be discernible in views to the casual observer.
10. Whilst the loss of the hanging tiles on the bay window is unfortunate, given that render is characteristic of the locality, I find there would be no material harm to the character and appearance of the property and area generally from its installation,

subject to a condition requiring it to be painted a colour which has been first agreed by the Council. This is because the dark grey, almost black colour has an unpleasant and oppressive appearance which appears significantly incongruous in this context.

11. To the rear I observed that houses in the vicinity of the site include extensions of varying design, including dormer windows. However, whilst I noted a small number of rear dormers in this terrace, none appeared to be of the same scale as that subject of the appeal and those I saw incorporated more sensitive materials. Whilst there are similarly large dormer windows in the surrounding area, as seen in the appellant's images, the appeal property is not viewed in context with those.
12. In this case, the dormer extension occupies a significant proportion of the roof slope. As a result of its scale, box-like form and materials, the dormer has a 'top heavy' and dominant appearance within the roof slope, poorly related to the dwellings character and style. Consequently, the dormer adversely affects the appearance of the property and area generally.
13. Whilst the rear elevation of the property is not readily seen in wider public views, the dormer is clearly visible from neighbouring dwellings and their gardens because of its elevated position. In such views, the dormer will appear as a discordant feature.
14. The appellant stated that they would be willing to re-clad the dormer however, no details were provided and this would not in any event address the harm in respect of the scale and bulk.
15. Given my above findings, I consider that the hip to gable end roof extension, rooflights and external wall insulation, without the dormer, would have an acceptable effect upon the character and appearance of the property and area generally.
16. There would therefore be no conflict with the overall design aims of policies BD1 and DMP1 of the London Borough of Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 Adopted February 2022, which together require that development is of the highest urban design quality and, amongst other things, of a scale, detailing and design that complements the locality. It would also conform overall to the guidance set out in the Council's SPD.

Other Matters

17. I acknowledge the concerns of a third-party regarding nesting birds however, there is no substantive evidence that the hip to gable end roof extension has resulted in an increase in nesting birds, nor that birds are causing materially harmful levels of noise and disturbance or damage to property. This is therefore a matter of limited weight.

Overall conclusion on ground (a)

18. For the reasons given, I find that the hip to gable end roof extension, rooflights and external wall insulation are acceptable, subject to a condition. The rear dormer window is not acceptable however, since it appears to me that the removal of the dormer window would resolve the harm, I consider it is appropriate to issue a split decision. I therefore intend to grant planning permission under s177(5) of the 1990

Act for the hip to gable end roof extension, rooflights and external wall insulation, with the removal of the dormer.

Conditions

19. The Council has not suggested any conditions. A time limit or plans condition is not necessary since the developments are complete. A condition requiring a painting scheme be submitted and the external insulation painted is necessary in the interests of visual amenity.

The appeal on ground (f)

20. The appeal on ground (f) is that the requirements of the notice exceed what is necessary.
21. The appellant's case under ground (f) I have already considered under ground (a). Although planning permission has been granted in respect of parts of the development enforced against, the notice has been upheld without varying any requirements relating to them, since this could have given rise to two separate planning permissions, namely the one that has been granted in this appeal decision and the one that would be deemed to be granted by section 173(11) due to under-enforcement.
22. The appeal on ground (f) fails.

Conclusion

23. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should succeed in part only, and I will grant planning permission for the erection of a hip to gable end roof extension, rooflights and the installation of external insulation to the exterior of the premises at 54 College Road, Wembley HA9 8RJ, but otherwise I will uphold the notice and refuse to grant planning permission in respect of the rear dormer window. The requirements of the notice will cease to have effect so far as inconsistent with the planning permission which I will grant by virtue of section 180 of the 1990 Act (as amended).

Felicity Thompson

INSPECTOR