

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2016

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurp MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 9 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/16/3147465
165B Fleetwood Road, London NW10 1NP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Bothina Mayers against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 15/3373, dated 5 August 2015, was refused by notice dated 12 November 2015.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a hip to gable end extension, two rear dormer windows and installation of two front rooflights to first floor flat at 165B Fleetwood Road, London NW10 1NP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 15/3373, dated 5 August 2015, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with [the following approved plans: location plan, drawing numbers 1, 2, 3A, 5, 6A and 7A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the hip to gable end extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development used in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However in allowing the appeal I have used the description stated on the Council's decision notice and on the appeal form as I consider that this more accurately describes the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.
-

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two storey semi-detached property located at the end of Fleetwood Road, close to the junction with Park Avenue North. The host building has a stepped hipped roof whereas the other half of the semi has a pitched roof. Both have prominent and matching two storey front gable features. The surrounding area is generally characterised by semi-detached properties of a similar scale and appearance to the host building. Roof forms vary and there are numerous examples of pitched roofs, pitched roof extensions and of dormers in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site.
5. Though the proposal would extend the lower hipped roof of the host building to form a pitched roof, the main hipped roof would be retained. The subservient height and secondary nature of the proposed pitched roof means that its visual impact and its impact on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area would be lessened and it would not appear out of scale. In any event as stated, the immediate surrounding area is characterised by varied roof forms and consequently the proposed roof extension would not be incongruous. The existing roof form of the host building and its neighbour are not symmetrical at present and therefore there would be no loss of symmetry resulting from the proposal. The symmetrical front gable features would remain and would be unaffected by the proposal.
6. The guidance regarding roof extensions in SPG5 (2002) has been referred to by the Council and I note that SPG5 states that the roof form of the host building and of other buildings in the street is a significant part of the area's character. Whilst not all of the criteria listed for hip to gable extensions in SPG5 are met by the proposal, for the reasons stated, the proposed pitched roof would not be harmful in this instance having regard to the particular circumstances of the appeal site.
7. I note that the Council's concerns regarding the rear dormers appear to centre on the fact that the smaller dormer could only be formed following the hip to gable extension. Both dormers would be located on the rear elevation of the host building, would be of an appropriate design and scale relative to the host building and would not be prominent and I note that if considered in isolation the Council would not have objected to the larger dormer.
8. I understand that a previous application for extensions to the host building was amended to remove elements comprising part of the proposal at the request of the Council prior to permission being granted (Ref 14/4930). I also note the Council's concerns regarding a possible future use of the extended roofspace as a separate flat given that was what was originally proposed by the previous application. However I am unaware of the details or particular circumstances relating to the previous application and in any event I must determine the proposal before me on its own merits. For the reasons stated I am satisfied that the proposal is acceptable and would not be harmful.
9. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposal would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the host building or the surrounding area. It therefore complies with the development plan and in particular policies BE2 and BE9 of Brent's Unitary Development Plan, Policy CP17 of the London Borough of Brent Core Strategy and with relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies seek, amongst other things, to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Though the proposal is not wholly in compliance with the guidance regarding hip to gable extensions contained within SPG5, for the reasons stated it is not considered harmful to either the host building or the surrounding area or to conflict with the general aim of SPG5 to achieve well designed extensions and alterations.

Conditions

10. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring the hip to gable roof extension to be constructed in materials to match the host building. This is having regard to the scale and position of the roof extension and to protect the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR