



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 November 2023

by R Major BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/23/3321500

24 Fernwood Avenue, Brent, Wembley HA0 2HF

- 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 Syed Islam against the decision of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref Application No: 23/0459, dated 9 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is proposed loft floor hip to gable with rear dormer, floor plan redesign and all associated works.
-

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. Number 24 Fernwood Avenue is a first floor flat situated within a two-storey semi-detached property. The appeal site is located on a residential street that runs parallel to, and at a slightly lower land level than, Bridgewater Road, which is a busy classified highway (A4005).
4. This section of Fernwood Avenue is characterised by hipped roof semi-detached properties. The appeal property is typical of the other buildings in this row, which were designed with forward protruding two-storey elements that include a projecting canted style two-storey front bay window. Above these bay windows is an attractive overhanging eaves detail, with a hipped roof design to match the main dwelling. These forward projecting elements, bay windows and the hipped roof design are all positive and defining features of these buildings. The symmetry and consistency in the design of the properties in this row only further adds to the positive contribution they make to the character of the area. Dormer extensions are not a characteristic of Fernwood Avenue.
5. The buildings along this section of Fernwood Avenue do not follow a uniform building line, with the adjacent semi-detached block to the south east, Nos 25, 26, 27 and 28, being set significantly further back from the highway than the appeal property and the other buildings in this row. This set back is so significant that the front elevations of Nos 25, 26, 27 and 28 are set further back than the rear elevations of the other properties in this row, including the appeal property.

6. The proposed large rear dormer, facilitated by the hip to gable roof enlargement, would unbalance the existing and distinct symmetry enjoyed with the adjoining property, as well as the other properties in this row. Additionally, the appearance of the dormer, with its flat roof design and being set up to the ridge height of the main dwelling, results in a bulky and incongruous form of development that is detrimental to the appearance of the host property, the adjoining property, and street scene in general.
7. Furthermore, the setting of the dormer up to the existing ridge height of the main dwelling also runs contrary to the advice contained within the Council's 'Residential Extensions and Alterations' Supplementary Planning Document 2 (2018) (SPD) which states that rear dormers should be set down from the ridge by at least 0.3m.
8. The visual prominence of the development in the street scene is exacerbated by the significant setback of the neighbouring properties immediately to the southeast, resulting in the side and rear elevations of the appeal property, and therefore the proposed development, being visible from the street. As such, the proposed development would not only be visible from the front elevations of Nos 25, 26, 27 and 28, and the rears of a number of properties situated to the rear of the appeal site, but also from public vantage points to the front of the appeal site, including Fernwood Avenue and Bridgewater Road (A4005), especially when viewed from the south.
9. In view of the above, the proposal would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. The appeal scheme is contrary to the objectives of Policy DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 (2022) which seeks to ensure, amongst other things, that all development proposals are of a scale and design that provides high levels of external amenity and complements the locality.
10. The proposal would also be contrary to the guidance relating to dormers contained within the SPD, as well as paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that development that is not well designed should be refused.

Conclusion

11. The proposal therefore conflicts with the development plan when taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. Accordingly, for the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Major

INSPECTOR