



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2023

by A Hickey MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/22/3304389

7 Carlyon Road, Brent, Wembley HA0 1HP

- 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 Fred Richard of Fred Richard & Associates against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 22/0890, dated 8 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is rear dormer with hip to gable roof extension and alterations made to the first floor side extension of the dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rear dormer with hip to gable roof extension and alterations made to the first floor side extension of the dwellinghouse at 7 Carlyon Road, Brent, Wembley HA0 1HP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/0890, dated 8 March 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 01, 06 and 07.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the development has been amended to reflect the dormer extension shown on the proposed plans. Both the main parties have had the opportunity to comment on the revised description. This has been amended in the Banner Heading above accordingly.
3. At the time of my site visit, a side extension and dormer had been constructed. The development on-site did not reflect the design of this appeal. Accordingly, in the interests of fairness, I have considered the appeal on the basis that the development is proposed as shown on the application drawings.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. No. 7 Carlyon Road occupies a corner plot and is prominently sited on the end of a two-storey terrace at the junction with Carlyon Close. During my site visit, I observed many corner plot properties nearby have been altered with the addition of a two-storey side extension. In the case of the appeal property, the existing two-storey side extension also projects outward past the original rear elevation of the property, partially screening the rear roof slope.
6. The Council's Residential Extensions & Alterations Supplementary SPD 2 (SPD) advises that care should be taken with the design of any rear dormer. It goes on to require dormers to be set down from the ridge by at least 0.3m and up from the eaves line by at least 0.5m.
7. In this case, the proposed rear dormer would be set down by 0.4m from the ridge and set up by 0.3m from the eaves, which would not be in line with the SPD. Nevertheless, during my site visit, I observed the appeal property and surrounding area from Carlyon Road and Carlyon Close. The proposed hip-to-gable alteration would see no change to the projecting two-storey rear element of the side extension. The proposed lack of a set-up from the eaves would, therefore, be entirely hidden from views along Carlyon Road.
8. From the glimpsed views at the side and rear of the host dwelling, the lack of set-up would result in a somewhat bulky appearance within the roofscape on the terrace row. However, this is offset as the dormer would be seen against the backdrop of the multi-storey apartment complex, which has an arrangement of flat roofs over a staggered building line of varying height. This apartment building and the existing rear projecting roof of the extension mean that the dormer would neither draw the eye nor appear as an incongruous addition to the host dwelling or surrounding area.
9. Consequently, whilst there would be some limited conflict with the SPD there would be no conflict with Policy DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan (LP), insofar as it, amongst other things, requires the siting, materials, detailing and design of development to complement the locality, or LP Policy BD1 which requires good design that responds to local character.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the tests set out in Paragraph 56 of the Framework. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
11. A condition controlling external surfaces is necessary in the interests of local character.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Hickey

INSPECTOR