

Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 21 March 2017

by C J Anstey BA (Hons) DipTP DipLA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7th April 2017

Appeal A. Ref: APP/T5150/D/17/3170042

35 Helena Road, London, NW10 1HY

- 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 Miss Natalie Moore against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
- The application Ref 16/5041, dated 21 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 January 2017.
- The development proposed is removal of chimney and erection of a partial hip-to-gable end roof extension, rear dormer window and 2 front roof-lights to convert loft space of dwelling-house.

Appeal B. Ref: APP/T5150/D/17/3170045

35 Helena Road, London, NW10 1HY

- 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 Miss Natalie Moore against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 16/5040, dated 21 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is removal of chimney and erection of side and rear dormer windows and 2 front roof-lights to convert loft space of dwelling-house.
-

Decisions

1. I dismiss both Appeal A and Appeal B.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in both appeals is the effect on the appearance of 35 Helena Road and on the character of the local area.

Reasons

3. No. 35 Helena Road is a two-storey semi-detached house with an existing two storey rear and side extension. It is located on a residential street. Both the appeal proposals involve the addition of side and rear dormers.
 4. At present the side and rear roof slopes have a simple, uncluttered appearance that contributes to the pleasing appearance of the appeal property. The dormers in both Appeals A and B would occupy a significant part of each roof and would not relate well to the existing roof form or fenestration. As a result the dormers would appear overly dominant and incongruous, thereby
-

detracting from the appearance of the dwelling. The proposed side dormer in each appeal would be visible from the street, whilst the rear dormer in both appeals would be seen from nearby gardens. From these viewpoints the proposed dormers would appear as awkward and overly assertive additions and as a result cause harm to the character of the local area. The proposed materials and details would not mitigate this harm. Although there are a variety of styles and designs of houses in the area this does not obviate the need to ensure that any roof extensions complement the existing property. The unsatisfactory appearance of other roof additions in the local area highlights the importance of resisting insensitive schemes.

5. I conclude, therefore, on the main issue that both the Appeal A and B proposals would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of 35 Helena Road and on the character of the local area. In view of these findings both appeal proposals are contrary to the objectives of *Policy DMP1: Development Management General Policy* of the *London Borough of Brent Local Plan; Development Management Policies (2016)* and the Council's supplementary planning guidance *SPG5: Altering and Extending Your Home (2002)*. This policy and guidance is consistent with the terms of the *National Planning Policy Framework*.
6. These findings constitute compelling grounds for dismissing both Appeal A and Appeal B. None of the other matters raised, including the various extensions in the local area or the accommodation improvements that would result, outweigh the visual damage that would result from the appeal proposals.

Christopher Anstey

Inspector