
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2023

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 30.10.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/23/3326036

22 Alington Crescent, London, NW9 8JN

- 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 Mrs Kayathiri Pathmoarash against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 23/0632, dated 25 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as roof alterations for room in a roof conversion with rear dormer and skylights to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling, standing in a street of largely similar development. It has a typical suburban appearance reflecting the time of its construction, being brick built with, at the front, a double bay window, tile hanging and a tiled roof. It has been extended before, in a sympathetic manner, with the scale and appearance of the extension, including its hipped roof, harmonising with that of the host property and the original roof.
4. The proposal involves the replacement of the hip in the main roof with a gable which would form an integral part of a box shaped dormer to be inserted in the rear roof. I regard the design as functional, clumsy and unattractive. The dormer's scale would prove disproportionate to the host property's roof, which would appear top heavy as a result. Far from harmonizing with the overall architectural appearance of the property the roof extension would harmfully transform it into an unattractive structure. Whilst, sometimes, rear dormers such as this can be shielded from the public realm, in this case the development would be clearly apparent from the front and from the rear when entering the Crescent from Mallard Way.
5. The main justification for the proposal is that it '*was in keeping with similar developments in the area*'. I saw the developments referred to but, in my view, they are not convincing advertisements for good design, quite the contrary. For the most part, the properties in the Crescent have maintained

their original character, and of those extended most have done do harmoniously and in keeping with the host property.

6. Accordingly, I conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings. A clear conflict arises with those aspects of Brent's Development Management Policies Document policy DMP1 requiring the design of new development to complement the locality and to provide high levels of external amenity.
7. In addition, The Framework¹ provides that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, and that development that is not well designed should be refused. I intend to follow that guidance in this case.

Other matters

8. All other matters raised in the representations have been taken into account. I note that none of the neighbours close the appeal site objected, but this is insufficient reason to affect my conclusions.
9. I have taken note of the Council's references to its Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Residential Extensions and Alterations.
10. No other matter is of such strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations that led me to my conclusion that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

¹ National Planning Policy Framework (2023)