



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2020

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/20/3246388

119 Valley Drive, London NW9 9NT

- 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 Mr Jim Walsh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 19/4112, dated 19 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is addition of a side dormer to provide access to the existing loft space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The application form gives the applicant's name as 'Walsh'. I have used the appellant's full title, Mr Jim Walsh, as confirmed on the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Valley Drive is predominantly characterised by two-storey semi-detached dwellings more often with hipped roof forms. The dwelling on the appeal site is consistent with this character.
5. The side dormer would be set down from the ridge and up from the eaves in accordance with the guidance in the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2 (2018) (SPD). It would also be set behind the chimney stack. Even so, the side dormer would jar with the traditional hipped roof design of the dwelling. It would compromise the host dwelling's character and would appear incongruous within the street scene.
6. My attention has been drawn to other roof alterations in the area. I am not aware of the full planning history of these properties or the development plan policies that were in place at the time when they were erected. In any case, I noted during my site visit that alterations to dwellings on Valley Drive were more often either associated with two-storey side extensions or consisted of a comprehensive remodelling of the roof from hip to gable. Where side dormers do exist, they are not reflective of the prevailing character of the area and do

not convince me that the proposed dormer would make a positive contribution to the appearance of the dwelling or its surroundings.

7. I conclude that the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard the proposal conflicts with Policy CP17 (Protecting and Enhancing the Suburban Character of Brent) of the London Borough of Brent Core Strategy (2010) and Policy DMP1 (Development Management General Policy) of the London Borough of Brent Development Management Policies (2016) which amongst other things seek to protect the suburban character of the area and ensure that development is of a design that complements the locality.

Other Matter

8. The appellant suggests that it is crucial for families to be able to expand into the roof space in London. However, this should not come at the expense of the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, I am not persuaded by the evidence before me that the proposed dormer is the only way in which the dwelling could be extended and that there are no alternatives that would better respond to the characteristics of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out, the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR