



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 August 2022

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/22/3293735

16 Sherrick Green Road, London, NW10 1LD

- 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 Rajmund Modriansky against the decision of the London Borough of Brent Council.
 - The application Ref 21/3668 dated 28 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is retention of hip to gable end roof extension, wider dormer window with Juliet balcony, three front rooflights, one rear rooflight. Retention of increase of roof depth and height to garage roof and one front rooflight to garage roof to dwellinghouse. Proposed hip-to-gable to side extension to form crown roof, with two rear rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have utilised the Council's description of the development as per the decision notice as I feel it more concisely describes the development.
3. The application is made on a retrospective basis.
4. The new Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 (LP) was adopted by the Council on 24 February 2022. The policies within the refusal reason, from the Development Management Policies Plan 2016 and the Core Strategy 2010, have been formally revoked and are no longer part of the development plan for Brent and are not part of the determination of the appeal which is before me. In light of this both parties were given opportunity to comment upon this change as part of this appeal, however, no further comments have been received.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling in a predominantly residential area opposite a school. The site has relevant planning history as outlined in the Council's report as well as in the appellant's submissions. A previous permission (ref: 17/2455 – image 19 of the appellant's statement) shows a side to rear two-storey extension with a hipped roof, and a smaller dormer which was situated to the right of the roof of the first floor extension.

7. The proposal, as built, is a full width dormer with a hip-to-gable roof extension. The main changes in the proposals before me (from previous permissions) are at roof level. The appeal seeks to retain the constructed hip to gable roof extension and full width dormer as well as incorporating a hip to gable extension to the side extension to create a crown roof. There are therefore several elements to the appeal proposal. The refusal reason is specific in its reference to the combination of extensions forming a discordant and top-heavy development due to their roof profiles and relationship with the existing dormer.
8. At the time of my site visit I noted that some properties along the road have been extended and I noted examples of full width rear dormers with hip to gable extensions in the surrounding area. Whilst this is acknowledged it should be kept in mind that those examples have not been extended to the extent of the combined proposals at the appeal site and the roof forms I found to be generally uniform in character. In isolation I do not find the hip to gable extension and full width dormer to be uncharacteristic nor detract from the area given examples within the immediate area. It is the combination of roof forms which creates negative impact as outlined below.
9. The guidance within the Residential Extensions and Alterations 2018 (SPD2) guidance states that the roof should match the pitch angle and materials used on the main roof of the house. Flat roofed or false pitch roofs are unacceptable. Proposed extensions should have a hipped side roof plane where the existing roof is hipped to the side, and a gable end where it is gabled. The hip to gable extension to the side extension to create a crown roof does not match the angle of the main roof. The proposed side elevation would be visible in views from the street scene when, for example, stood on the raised blockwork across the road from the school which is slightly closer than the view submitted by the appellant in image twenty-five of their statement.
10. The location, opposite a school, is one which I would expect to be busy and would consider to be a prominent location in terms of public perception as a result of general movement to, from and waiting around, the school. This is not altered by the design features outlined in paragraph 6.9 of the appellant's statement. The visual impact of the proposals would therefore result in development which would not be in keeping with the surrounding area and the chosen design for the two-storey side extension fails to accord with the design guidance within SPD2.
11. I do not find that the proposals would result in improvements to the appearance of the property from directly in front. Whilst the hip to gable of the main roof and side extension would have a similar appearance the design of the side extension is contrived to reduce the height to present as subservient to the host building. I find the combination of hip to gable proposals present as dominant considering the generally consistent characteristics of the roofs and pairs of dwellings within the area. It does not complement the streetscene or improve the host dwelling and presents as a strong visual contrast to the neighbouring properties.
12. SPD2 guidance generally permits rear dormers, which can be the full width of the original roof plane. Hip-to gable roof extensions are generally permitted unless there is an existing two storey side extension with a hipped roof. Dormers which project onto over a rear projection (whether original or an

extension to the house) will not normally be permitted. In this case the wider dormer proposed merges with a two-storey side and rear extension. The previously approved dormer was smaller than is now the case and this would have enabled it not to clash with the rear extension.

13. The combination of the side extension with the first floor rear extension is one which would wrap around the host dwelling as well as crossing over the full width dormer. I find the proposal engulfs the host dwelling rendering the rear elevation unrecognisable which detracts from the both the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. The combination of roof forms which would be created from the side extension, first floor rear extension and their interaction with the full length dormer presents as awkward and top heavy with roof slopes crossing over the dormer. They do present as sympathetic to the host dwelling or the surrounding area and are not a proportionate addition in combination.
14. Image twenty-six, provided by the appellant, shows varying extensions to the row within which the appeal site stands. A number of these show hip to gable extensions as well as full dormers. They do not, however, demonstrate such elements in conjunction with a side extension of comparable roof form nor the interaction with the as built first floor rear extension. The proposal would not, therefore, be in keeping with the surrounding area. The location at the rear of the property, where public views are more limited, does not reduce the requirement for an emphasis on good design. The combination of proposals before me would still be uncharacteristic and contrary to the sum of all the qualities which distinguish the area.
15. The proposal is contrary to the guidance contained within SPD2 as outlined within this decision letter. Whilst it is acknowledged as guidance SPD2 has the overall objective of securing development that is appropriate and sympathetic to the character of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. The proposal would also be contrary to paragraph 130 of the Framework which confirms that decisions should ensure that developments add to the overall quality of the area and are sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

16. Reference to planning history has been made, in Ellesmere Road, however, other than the reference number no further evidence of permission is provided for context which limits the weight which can be attributed to them albeit each case must be considered on its own merits. In a differing road they would not be viewed as part of the immediately surrounding area that the proposals would be viewed in context with. The proposals mentioned were also Certificates of Lawfulness, under permitted development, and not householder planning applications as with the appeal before me and for a hip to gable extension and rear dormer only.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR