



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2021

by M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/20/3258130

4 Egerton Gardens, London NW10 3LD

- 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 Ms Emily Huc against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 20/0902, dated 16 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is loft extension over previously granted two storey side extension. 2no. new rooflights – one on front roofscape and one on rear roofscape.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft extension over previously granted two storey side extension. 2no. new rooflights – one on front roofscape and one on rear roofscape at 4 Egerton Gardens, London NW10 3LD, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/0902, dated 16 March 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: EG.OB.01, EG.EP.01, EG.EP.02, EG.EP.03, EG.EP.04 EG.PP.01, EG.PP.02, EG.PP.03, EG.EE.01, EG.EE.02, EG.EE.03, EG.ES.01, EG.PE.01, EG.PE.02, EG.PE.03 and EG.PS.01 and EG.PP.04 insofar as this drawing is consistent with the other approved proposed drawings.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matters

2. There would appear to be a discrepancy between drawing EG.PP.04 (Proposed roof plan) and some of the other proposed drawings in respect of the siting of the proposed dormer. However, for the purposes of my assessment, I have considered the siting of the dormer on the basis of drawings EG.PE.03 (Proposed rear elevation) and EG.PS.01 (Proposed section A-A).

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling within a small cul-de-sac of properties with a similar architectural style. Nevertheless, a number of nearby properties have been subject to additions in the form of side extensions and roof alterations, including hip to gable conversions and dormer extensions.
5. Consequently, the designs and scales of the properties in the area are varied, creating a diverse streetscape. The degree of symmetry between corresponding pairs of semi-detached dwellings has also been altered. This includes the appeal property which incorporates a two-storey side extension with a mono-pitched roof. This, therefore, clearly distinguishes the appeal property from the largely unaltered adjoining semi-detached dwelling.
6. The proposed hip to gable conversion would not be dissimilar to others nearby and the section which would extend over the side extension, incorporates an appreciably lower ridge height. Therefore, the variation in the roofline would reflect the change in design between the original dwelling and the side extension, along with giving the latter a subservient appearance.
7. The proposal would increase the size of the roof at the appeal property, in particular over the existing side extension. However, this part of the new roof would be recessed from the front of the property with a similar pitch to its main roof. As a consequence of these design interventions and its lower height, the overall increase in scale and alterations to the form of the original roof would not be particularly discernible in the context of the varied streetscape. Most notably, the appearance of the dwelling would continue to be dominated by its front gable which is a prominent feature of the appeal property and others nearby.
8. The form of the rear dormer is consistent with others nearby and its scale would be proportionate to the size of the extended roof. Whilst I note the Council's reference to advice from the 'Residential extensions and alterations SPD 2 (2018)' ('SPD 2') I have not received the section of SPD 2 which is relevant to rear dormers. In any event, for the reasons stated, I consider no harm would result from the overall scale of the dormer before me, and so any conflict with the guidance contained in the SPD is not a basis to dismiss the appeal.
9. Overall, and in the context of the already extended appeal property and area, the proposed alterations would be appropriate in terms of design and scale. Consequently, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and accords with Policy DMP1 of the Brent Development Management Policies Plan (2018) which amongst other things requires that development is of a design and scale that complements the locality.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard timescale condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission, I have imposed a condition specifying the approved drawings as this provides certainty. A condition requiring proposed external materials to match the existing property is necessary in the interests of the appearance of the development.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

M Aqbal

INSPECTOR