



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 July 2023

by K Lancaster BA (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/23/3316256

182C Chamberlayne Road, Brent, London NW10 3JT

- 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 Spencer Alexander against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 22/1333, dated 11 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is a rear dormer with rooflights on front slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site, 182c Chamberlayne Road comprises a top floor flat within an end-terrace property, which is prominently sited at the junction of Chamberlayne Road and Leighton Gardens. The appeal site, as a corner property exhibits a form of architectural design that reflects its corner location, and unlike other properties within the terrace, has its front door located within its side elevation, facing onto Leighton Gardens. Chamberlayne Road is of mixed character with residential, commercial and education uses present close by. The wider area is predominately residential in character.
4. The proposal would involve the alteration of the main rear roof slope to provide a dormer extension, thereby increasing the amount of accommodation available in the top floor flat. It would extend the full width of the rear roof slope and include a Juliet balcony and two small windows which would sit either side of the ridge of the rear two storey outrigger.
5. The Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD2 - Supplementary Planning Document (SPD2) provides guidance on dormer extensions and states that the roof form of a house and other houses in the street is a significant part of the areas character, therefore, alterations to a roof should be designed to complement the property and the original character of the street. In relation to rear dormer extensions, the guidance supports proposals that would extend the full width of the original roof plane, outside of a Conservation Area, but includes a requirement for them to be set up from the eaves by 0.5m and down from the ridge by 0.3m.

6. Whilst I accept that the proposal would not exceed the ridge height, and that the existing parapet, chimney stack and roof profile of the rear projection would be retained, the proposed dormer extension would not meet the above requirements in terms of being set down from the ridge and up from the eaves by the distances set out in the SPD2. Although each case should be determined on its own merits, having regard to the context of the location, I find that, in this particular case, the addition of a dormer of this scale, siting and design would be unduly dominant and would fail to complement the existing building.
7. Due to the relationship of the proposal to the rear two storey outrigger and the angled flank wall, the introduction of a dormer extension on the main roof slope would result in an awkward juxtaposition between these roof elements, which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.
8. Whilst the proportions of the new window openings on the rear elevations would be at odds with the more traditional fenestration of the host property, they would not be unduly harmful, given that the dormer would be read as an addition to the property. I agree with the Council that the addition of three rooflights in the front elevation roof slope would be an acceptable alteration. However, the absence of harm in these respects is a neutral factor which neither weighs for or against the proposal.
9. My attention has been drawn to examples of dormer extensions within the local area, including No. 186 Chamberlayne Road and Nos. 1 and 2 Leighton Gardens, which are all close to the appeal site. However, unlike the appeal site which has a prominent, corner location, these properties are not as prominently sited. Furthermore, I have not been provided with any details of planning applications for these works. Therefore, whilst these appear to be recent additions, I am not able to determine whether there are any direct comparisons with the appeal site. In any event, each case must be assessed on its own individual merits.
10. Consequently, I therefore find that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan 2022, which amongst other things, requires development to add to the overall quality of the area and be of a layout, scale, materials, detailing and design that would complement the locality. The proposal would also be contrary to the guidance contained within the SPD2, for the reasons set out above.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, the proposal would not accord with the development plan when taken as a whole. There are no material considerations of sufficient weight that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

K Lancaster

INSPECTOR