



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2021

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/20/3263007

40 Langler Road, London, NW10 5TL

- 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 Holly and Jake Lofdahl against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 20/2169, dated 21 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as an 'outrigger roof extension.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. The Council's decision describes the proposal as 'proposed outrigger roof extension works including erection of single storey side extension; replacement of windows to front and rear projections; replacement of door at rear and replacement of existing side boundary fence and gate to dwellinghouse' and as this describes the proposal in more detail I have used this as the basis for my decision.
3. Most of the works applied for under this application have already been approved under a recent planning permission (20/0992) and Lawful Development Certificate (20/1479) which are extant permissions. The Council has not objected to those parts of the proposal and from what I have seen, I have no reason to disagree. I have therefore considered only the proposed roof extension over the outrigger in this appeal.

Reasons

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. The development plan includes policy DMP1 in the Council's Development Management Policies document which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that proposals are of a scale and design that complements the locality.
5. The appeal site comprises an end terrace Victorian house in a residential street of similar properties. Whilst some properties have been extended to the rear, in general the dwellings retain their original form of a main building with a subservient outrigger which contributes to the attractive period character of the area.

6. The proposed roof extension would extend across some 3m of the outrigger with a height of some 2.9m and no set back from the eaves. Together with the approved loft conversion and rear dormer it would create an L-shaped dormer. Its siting would be contrary to the Council's guidance in its SPD2 Residential Extensions Design Guide (2018) which states that dormers that extend onto a rear projection will not normally be permitted.
7. I saw at my visit that the neighbouring property at no 42 has a similar L-shaped dormer but the Council has no planning history for that and from what I saw it does not make a positive contribution to the area and does not therefore set a precedent for this proposal. Whilst I noted rear dormers at other properties in the street, I was unable to see any other comparable examples from the site and the Council says that there is only one other example in this terrace of ten dwellings. I therefore see no reason why the Council's guidance should not apply in this case.
8. At my visit I saw that the extension was substantially under construction and was able to fully assess its impact on site. Although it does not take up the full length of the outrigger and is sited below the main ridge of the property, the dormer is nevertheless sited at a high level and has an excessive height significantly above the ridge of the outrigger. As such, it does not reflect the proportions of the original house or the approved extensions. It has resulted in an overly bulky extension that appears top-heavy and is severely disproportionate to the dwelling. Both in itself and together with the approved rear dormer it appears unduly dominant and out of scale with the dwelling and the area. In addition, the proposed window has a horizontal emphasis which would not reflect the vertical proportions of the other windows in the house and would be at odds with its character.
9. Although not visible from the street, it can be clearly seen from the rear of the surrounding properties. Thus, by reason of its siting, size, scale and detail it would not be a subservient extension and would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.
10. The benefit in terms of increased space and quality of accommodation would be a private benefit for the appellants which would not outweigh the significant harm I have identified to the wider area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons stated above, I conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to policy DMP1 and the development plan. The appeal is dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector