



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2022

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2ND February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/21/3284948
8 Parkside, London, NW2 6RH

- 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 Anthony Gallagher against the decision of the London Borough of Brent Council.
 - The application Ref 21/2019, dated 26 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'proposed loft conversion with rear and side dormer extensions, raised ridge, internal alterations, floor plan redesign and all associated works'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Parkside is characterised by houses of a similar design that are detached in appearance but in most cases are linked at single storey level to the adjacent dwelling. The road rises steeply to the north west, towards Dollis Hill Lane.
4. The appeal proposal is for a loft conversion which would involve raising the ridge height of the dwelling from 7.82m to 8.01m, the enlargement of an existing rear dormer and a new side dormer and front rooflight.
5. The Council has produced the *Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2018)* (SPD) to assist householders in planning alterations to existing properties. It advises that rear dormers can be the full width of the original roof plane outside conservation areas. The guidance states that rear dormers should be set down from the ridge by at least 0.3m and must be set up from the eaves by at least 0.5m measured along the roof plane. The guidance is similar for side dormers which will only be allowed if well designed and where the dormer does not compromise the building's or the street's character.
6. There is an existing flat roof 'box' dormer on the rear elevation of the dwelling. This dormer is not set down from the ridge of the dwelling but is centrally

located within the roof slope and is well set in from both sides and is set up from the eaves. I acknowledge that the Council's officer report states that the dormer was approved under LPA ref. 16/2379 but along with other discrepancies, was not built in accordance with the approved plans. However, I do not have any further evidence before me regarding this matter and I shall determine the appeal based on the information before me.

7. I am satisfied that the proposed increased ridge height of the dwelling would be acceptable in the street scene and would not be particularly discernible having regard to the variation in ridge heights along Parkside due to the steep gradient of the road.
8. The proposed rear dormer would be in the same position as the existing but would be wider and would incorporate additional glazing and sloping sides. Similarly, it would not be set down from the ridge of the dwelling which would be slightly raised but it would be set up from the eaves.
9. As the proposed dormer would not be set down from the ridge of the dwelling, it would have the appearance of a highly dominant and visually intrusive and bulky addition to the roof. In my view, it would have a rather stark appearance when read against the remainder of the roof slope due to its design and in particular, due to the overall width and depth of the glazing panels proposed. The angled sides would also appear odd when read against the remainder of the roof slope and would further emphasise its incongruous design and appearance. This leads me to conclude that overall, the proposed rear dormer would significantly detract from and materially harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
10. There would also be limited views of the rear dormer from Dollis Hill Lane due to its elevated position and furthermore, views would also be obtainable from the houses to the rear of the appeal property, albeit at a distance. In my view the rear roof dormer extension would stand out as a particularly dominant and incongruous feature and as such would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
11. A side dormer is also proposed which would be slightly set down from the ridge of the dwelling and would be set up from the eaves by about 0.52m. The top of the dormer would have tiled, sloping sides which would disguise its flat top. It would be positioned centrally on the side roof plane and would be well set back from the front elevation of the dwelling. Whilst I agree with the Council that side dormers are not particularly common along this particular stretch of Parkside, I do not consider that the proposed side dormer would be an incongruous or a harmful addition to the dwelling or the street scene. Furthermore, I am also satisfied that the proposed front rooflight, which would replace an existing rooflight, would be acceptable in appearance.
12. I conclude that the proposed rear dormer extension would result in material harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policy DMP1 of the Brent Development Management Policies (2016) and Policy CP17 of the Brent Core Strategy (2010) which together seek to protect the distinctive suburban character of Brent from inappropriate development and require development to have a high level of internal and external amenity and complement the locality. It would also be contrary to the detailed design guidance set out within the SPD.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR