
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2022

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/22/3290374
49A Elm Road, Wembley HA9 7JA

- The appeal is made under section 78A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Miss Loretta Coyne against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 21/3811, dated 8 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2021.
 - The development is a rear dormer extension with Juliet balcony and window and 3 front rooflights to dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear dormer extension with Juliet balcony and window and 3 front rooflights to dwellinghouse at 49A Elm Road, Wembley HA9 7JA in accordance with the terms of the application Ref. 21/3811, dated 8 October 2021 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings:

Site Location Plan – Drawing Number 0530-49A.002

Proposed Plans – Drawing Number 0530-49A.103 Rev B

North and South Elevations – Drawing Number 0530-49A.303 Rev B

East and West Elevations – Drawing Number 0530-49A.304 Rev B
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the roof alterations hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The development was partly complete at the time of my visit, with only the fenestration of the dormer and its external finishing material to be changed to accord with the proposed plans. This has no bearing on my decision which is based on the planning merits of the case.
-

3. Since the application was determined, the Brent Local Plan has been formally adopted. My decision takes this into account.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

5. The appeal relates to a mid-terrace dwelling. It sits within a row of similar properties with a range of extensions present including single storey, two storey and roof dormer additions. Given the variety of alterations which have taken place, this group of dwellings has something of a haphazard appearance when viewed collectively from the rear.
6. A box dormer has been added to the rear of the appeal dwelling. It is of a similar size to the box dormers which have been introduced to the dwellings either side. The Council's concern is not with the overall size of the dormer; rather that it connects with the roof of an existing two storey rear extension.
7. The Council points to the fact this arrangement conflicts with the guidance contained within its adopted Supplementary Planning Document 2 titled '*Residential Extensions and Alterations*' (SPD). The SPD explains that dormers which project onto or over a rear projection will not normally be permitted. However, the dormer is set back from the eaves of the main dwelling and only marginally connects with the hipped roof of the extension where it ties into the main roof. It does not project over the main body of the extension itself.
8. As a result, I consider that the two storey extension and dormer are read as two distinct additions. Furthermore, this arrangement appears to be broadly similar to that at the attached property, No. 51 Elm Road and there is no suggestion that this development is unlawful. Within this context, I am satisfied that the dormer does not appear unduly bulky and when completed in accordance with the submitted plans and specification, it would be visually acceptable.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that when fully completed, the development before me would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings. In such terms, I find no conflict with policy DMP1 of the adopted Brent Local Plan or the overall aims of the SPD which promote development that delivers high levels of amenity and complements the locality.

Conditions

10. Given that the dormer is largely built, a condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission is not required. A condition which directs that the development takes place in accordance with the approved plans is required for the avoidance of doubt. I also agree with the Council that a condition to ensure the external finishing materials of the dormer extension match those of the host dwelling is necessary in order to ensure a visually acceptable development. In granting planning permission, I shall impose these conditions.

David Fitzsimon INSPECTOR