

Appeal Decision

Site visit undertaken on 6 October 2022

by J Somers BSocSci (Planning) MA (HEC) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision Date: 29th November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/22/3291793
7 Mount Pleasant Road, London NW10 3EG

- 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 Ms Duncan against the decision of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application, ref. 21/3521, dated 14 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a single storey ground floor extension, first floor extension, a roof extension (hip-to gable and rear roof), alteration and new fenestration and associated roof windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appellant's Statement of Case (SoC) mentions that subsequent to the lodging of the appeal, that the appeal site has had a planning approval and a certificate of lawful development which are material considerations relevant to this appeal. The first material consideration is a planning consent¹ for the demolition of existing conservatory and erection of single storey rear to side extension with roof lantern, first floor rear to side extension, hip to gable end roof extension, rear dormer window with two Juliet balconies, 7 front rooflights and new fenestration to the dwelling. The material consideration consists of a Certificate of lawful development² for a proposed hip to gable loft conversion with 3 Juliet balconies, roof extension and 2 front rooflights to dwellinghouse. Whilst the side extension proposed under the appeal is slightly different to what was approved and witnessed on site, much of the development under this appeal has been approved and currently under construction. The remaining element of the proposal that does not benefit from planning consent is the enlarged rear dormer window. Taking this into account, this appeal decision will only consider the enlargement of the rear dormer window as the last remaining element without consent.

¹ Brent Planning Ref No.

² Brent Planning Ref No. 21/4053

3. Reason for Refusal No.2 on the Councils Decision Notice relates to a log burner which was sought to be installed on the rear elevation of the rear extension. As the rear extension already benefits from consent and excluded the log burner (and which is also suggested in the appeal documents), it is considered that this matter has been resolved.

Main issues

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extended dormer window upon the character and appearance of the building and the locality.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located along Mount Pleasant Road, a carriageway which contains a formally laid out speculative housing development which appears to date from the early-mid twentieth century. Both sides of the road contain pairs of semi-detached dwellings with small gaps between dwellings providing glimpses between buildings to trees and greenery beyond. There is a symmetry between the dwellings which have the same characteristics and design elements with hipped rooves with forward projecting two storey canted bay windows with gable ends with mock timber boarding. Some of the dwellings retain London stock chimneys, and well vegetated front gardens with low boundary walls. To the rear are large vegetated gardens and whilst there are some extensions to rear roof forms, many are subservient to the original roof forms which for the most part remain intact with the exception of some hip to gable roof extensions which have caused detriment to the character of the area.
6. The appeal site displays a number of positive qualities which are experienced within the street scene, being one half of the characteristic semi-detached dwellings and containing many of the important design elements and original roof forms which reinforce the local character and distinctiveness of the area. Unfortunately, the building has undertaken a hip to roof extension which has changed the form and increased the visual massing and bulk of the existing roof. Despite this, the pitch of the existing roof from the rear is still evident with the installation of a rear dormer that is confined to the existing roof.
7. In undertaking extensions to the roofs of buildings, the London Borough of Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 (LP) Policy DMP1 seeks to ensure that alterations and additions achieve good design and reflect local characteristics, and is supported by the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2 (SPD). London Plan Policy D3 is also relevant and seeks a design led approach to new development which reinforces character, context and local distinctiveness.
8. With regards to the proposed rear roof dormer, given the later large flat roof extensions to the rear of the building, only the original roof form of the rear roof plane remains. The proposed box dormer with flat roof would not be confined to the existing pitched roof, but would project onto part of the flat roof of the first floor rear extension. The proposed rear dormer would be as wide as the host dwelling and would essentially remove all of the historic elements of the rear roof form. The proposed dormer window would not be seen as a subservient addition and would not be made in accordance with the SPD which seeks that dormer windows are modest in size and

constructed to the centre of the roof and set in from the edges of the roof in order to show subservience. This would not be the case in this proposal; the proposed rear roof dormer would be dominant and excessive in size and would not reinforce the positive qualities of local character and distinctiveness to the building or of the locality.

9. I note comments from the applicant's Statement of Case (SoC) that there are other dormer roof extensions in the vicinity. However based on the examples provided, these appear to be constructed within the plane of the existing roof and do not extend over the eaves of the roof onto the rear extension below. The proposal would appear more like an additional level than a dormer window and would accentuate the visual massing and bulk of the proposal, particularly when seen against the remaining half of the semi-detached dwelling which has a smaller dormer window that is confined to the existing plane of the roof.
10. Taken as a whole, and in conclusion of this matter, the proposed rear dormer would cause unacceptable detriment towards the architectural authenticity and integrity of the existing building and the character and appearance of the surrounding locality. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to the LP Policy DMP1, which is supported by the SPD and London Plan Policy D3.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

J Somers

INSPECTOR