



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2022

by Paul Thompson DipTRP MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/W/21/3284280

Flat C, 159 Bravington Road, London W9 3AT

- 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 Mauro Poletto against the decision of City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref 21/04535/FULL, dated 2 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is for a dormer extension with the addition of a rooflight, floor plan redesign and all associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the appearance of the host building and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to alterations to the roof of a three-storey mid-terraced property, situated to the eastern side of Bravington Road, within a residential area typified by similar terraces of houses. Like the appeal property, some of the rear roof slopes of properties have been altered, with box and individual dormers rooms added to enlarge attic spaces. These have been undertaken in a piecemeal fashion and their quality varies, but the majority of roofs remain generally unaltered and the roofscape remains relatively intact. This makes a significantly positive contribution to the appearance of the area.
4. As evidenced by the existing separate dormer windows installed at the property, there would be a fundamental difference between them and the appeal scheme. While the dormers are large, some of the rear roof slope remains apparent around them. Despite the use glass for cladding between the existing dormers, the resultant structure would appear as a continuous form across the roof. The resultant form and scale of the dormer window would therefore obscure much of the remaining roof slope and appear as a dominant and incongruous addition to the roof, which would jar with the prevailing characteristics found in the roofscape of the surrounding terraces of houses.
5. The proposal would not be visible from Bravington Road, but it would be prominent from properties to its rear and from the street within Marban Road. I accept that these views would be in the context of some poorly executed alterations to the roofs of other properties nearby and that there are other similar dormer windows further afield. Nevertheless, the existence visually

prominent and/or harmful dormer windows and other roof alterations, such as the mansard at No 161, would not provide justification for further development I consider would cause unacceptable harm to the appearance of the appeal property and its surroundings. Furthermore, many of the dormer windows referred to by the appellant concern significantly smaller and more of the roof slope remains about them, including at 164 and 166 Portnall Road.

6. The appellant has suggested that he would be willing to accept a planning condition to secure an alternative material for the cladding of the infilled section between the existing dormers. However, this would not overcome my concerns regarding the resultant scale of the dormer and I am mindful that this would circumvent consultation on such an alternative with interested parties, who would subsequently be deprived of the opportunity to comment.
7. In light of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would have a significantly detrimental effect on the appearance of the host building and its surroundings. Hence, the proposal would be contrary to the design aims of Policies 38 and 40 of the City Plan 2019 - 2040 (April 2021) and Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan 2021.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has suggested that the volume of a dormer window which could be erected under 'permitted development' should be considered as a 'fallback position'. However, the rights conveyed by the relevant statutory instrument¹ in respect of dormer windows do not apply to flats, a point which the appellant accepts. Accordingly, there would not appear to be a lawful fallback position.
9. The proposal would enable improvement to the internal living environment of the appellant's home, through an enlarged bathroom and bedroom, which would better meet the needs of the appellant.
10. Taking the proposal on its individual merits, these arguments would neither alter nor outweigh the concerns that I have raised with regard to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Paul Thompson

INSPECTOR

¹ The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).