



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 May 2024

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/24/3340307
63 Ealing Road, Wembley, Brent HA0 4BN

- 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 Abdoullah Attamohamid against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 23/3601, dated 15 November 2023, was refused by notice dated 6 February 2024.
 - The development proposed is double hip to gable extensions with two side box dormers to the rear gable.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Planning Inspectorate Procedural Guide: Planning Appeals – England 2024 states that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme, and that it is important that what is considered by the Inspector at appeal is essentially the same scheme that was considered by the Council and by interested parties at the application stage.
3. The appellant states that, if necessary, a condition could be imposed requiring that the proposed side dormers be stepped up by 0.5 metre. However, having regard to the above Guide, I have dealt with the scheme before me as depicted on the proposed drawings, and as was considered by the Council and by interested parties at application stage; and this alteration could not be appropriately addressed by means of a condition as suggested.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. Section 2.5 of the Brent Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document No 2 (2018) ('SPD') sets out that roof alterations should complement the host property and the original street character, but that the conversion of a hipped roof to a gable is generally acceptable.
6. Whilst they would be located towards the rear of the property, given that the proposed dormers would extend along the side plane of two sloping roofs, I agree with their description as 'side box dormers' on the application form. The

SPD states that side dormers will only be allowed if they are well designed and do not compromise the building's or the street's character; and that they should be set down from the ridge by at least 0.3 metre, and up from the eaves by at least 0.5 metre measured along the roof plane.

7. The Council does not object to the proposed hip to gable extensions. Given that the properties on Ealing Road have a mix of hips and gables, and that the host itself has a front projecting gable, I agree that that part of the scheme would not detract from the streetscene or from the character of the original dwelling.
8. The proposed side dormers would attach to the rear roofs of the proposed gables and would extend along the sides of the host property to just short of its upper floor rear face. Although they would be set down from the host's ridge, and 0.4 metre up from its eaves, each would cover most of the sloping roof in which it would be set.
9. As a result, they would have a substantial scale, and whilst they would not be visible in the streetscene, from the gardens and rear elevations of nearby properties they would dominate the original dwelling, and would give the resultant building a very top-heavy, rectilinear bulk. As they would not complement the character of the host, they would fail to accord with the general advice in the SPD.
10. Many of the dormers in the area referred to by the appellant, including those in Figures 3, 4 and 6 of his statement, appear to be smaller in scale compared to those proposed here. Whilst I observed a large rectilinear dormer to the side of 100A Ealing Road, and next to this site to the rear of 61 Ealing Road, they are not typical of the area or this particular row. Indeed, I observed that the other properties in this row overwhelmingly have simple, sloping roofs above ground floor level to the rear. Consequently, notwithstanding those isolated examples, and a large dormer to the rear of 14 The Close, this scheme would be at odds with the prevailing character of this area and this row.
11. The scheme would therefore harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would thus fail to accord with that part of Policy DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan 2019 - 2041 (2022) which states that development will be acceptable provided that its scale, detailing and design complements the locality. It would also conflict with the general approach in the SPD. Having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR