



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2021

by M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/21/3274481
19B Peel Road, Wembley HA9 7LY

- 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 Mick Hunter against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 21/0700, dated 26 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with rear dormer window and installation of 3 x front facing rooflights to first floor flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion with rear dormer window and installation of 3 x front facing rooflights to first floor flat at 19B Peel Road, Wembley HA9 7LY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/0700, dated 26 February 2021, 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 plans:
 - ABC195/1000 – Existing plans
 - ABC195/1001 – Existing elevations and section
 - ABC195/1002 – Proposed plans
 - ABC195/1003 – Proposed elevations and section.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Procedural Matter and Main Issue

2. As well as a rear dormer, the proposed development includes the installation of three rooflights on the front roof slope. The single reason for refusal on the decision notice refers only to the rear dormer, and the Council's officer report indicates that it considers the rooflights acceptable. I see no reason to disagree, and have limited my consideration in this appeal to the disputed matter of the proposed rear dormer.

3. The main issue is therefore the effect of the proposed rear dormer on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is the upper flat within a two-storey mid terraced building, originally a single dwelling but which at some point in the past has been converted into two self-contained flats. The building has a two-storey rear outrigger, and a long rear garden. The proposed dormer would extend across almost the full width of the main rear roof pitch, onto the pitched roof of the rear outrigger. The Council is of the view that the dormer would “not integrate both planes through a good design approach”, and that the dormer would “appear as a bulky addition and would be largely visible from the surrounding properties due to the long gardens”.
5. The Council’s 2018 *Residential Extensions & Alterations* Supplementary Planning Document (“the SPD”) provides guidance for roof extensions including rear dormers. It states that, outside Conservation Areas, rear dormers can be the full width of the original roof plane, should be set down from the ridge by at least 0.3m, and must be set up from the eaves line by at least 0.5m measured along the roof plane. I acknowledge that the proposed dormer would be visible from the rear of neighbouring properties on Byron Road, although that it could be seen would not in itself amount to causing harm. It would not extend beyond the rear elevation of the host building, and would comply with the size guidelines in the SPD. I therefore do not consider that in itself it would be an unacceptably bulky or dominant addition.
6. The SPD also states that dormers which project onto or over a rear projection will not normally be permitted, although it does not elaborate as to why. I entirely accept that an L-shaped dormer projecting over the rear outrigger, for example, would be likely to appear awkward and cumbersome, and so would be unlikely to be appropriate. However, that is not what is proposed here. From Byron Road I was able to see the dormer at the rear of 23 Peel Road to which the Council drew my attention, although I note the comment in the officer report that this other example arose from permitted development rather than a planning application. Nevertheless, the dormer at No 23 is similar to that which is proposed in this case, and I was able to see that it is not an overbearing or dominant feature. Furthermore, because it is rectangular rather than L-shaped it does not appear visually awkward or incongruous in terms of its relationship with the roof of the rear outrigger below. I see no reason why the same considerations would not apply to the current proposal at the appeal property.
7. Taking all of this together, I find that the proposed dormer would not be a dominant or incongruous addition to the host building, nor would it be overbearing when seen from neighbouring properties. I therefore conclude that it would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Notwithstanding the limited conflict with advice in the SPD, the development would comply with Policy DMP1 of the 2016 Brent Local Plan Development Management Policies Plan, which among other things seeks to ensure that development is appropriate to its locality in siting, scale, materials and design.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans so as to provide certainty. In order to protect the character and

appearance of the host property and surrounding area I have also included a condition requiring materials matching the existing dwelling to be used.

Conclusion

9. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

M Cryan

Inspector