



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2024

**by Lewis Condé BSc, MSc, MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 25 October 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/24/3345009**

**2 Egerton Gardens, Brent, London, NW10 3LD**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Daniel Slowe against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
  - The application Ref is 24/0707.
  - The development proposed is front roof valley infill with straight gable and addition of 1 no. rooflights to front roofscape.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken directly from the original planning application form. However, the Council changed the application description to '*Proposed hip to gable extension and rear dormer window with 5x rooflights and Juliet balcony to the Dwellinghouse*' and this has been used on the decision notice, as well as by the appellant on the appeal form. I find the updated description to provide a more accurate representation of the proposed development and I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling located within Egerton Gardens, a small residential cul-de-sac. Except for the appeal dwelling, properties within the street are semi-detached. The precise appearance of dwellings in the street also varies, including there being a variety in the style and design of roof forms, while several dwellings have been subject to previous alterations. Nonetheless, dwellings within the street (including the appeal property) retain a broad sense of continuity in their appearance, in part due to sharing common architectural features, their use of materials, as well as generally being of similar scale and proportions.
5. The appeal dwelling occupies a prominent position within the street, near its junction with the main road. The dwelling's roof consists of hipped elements towards the front and rear of the dwelling, together with a projecting front

gable that sits over two-storey bay windows. Currently the appeal dwelling displays a neat and attractive built form, that has a visual sense of balance.

6. Planning permission (ref:23/3287) has already been secured for hip to gable extensions to the appeal property, together with a sizeable flat roof dormer to the rear<sup>1</sup>. The works approved under permission 23/3287 are replicated within the current appeal scheme. However, the current proposal further involves gabling off an existing hipped roof element to the front of the property along its western elevation and incorporating an area of flat roof. In effect, this would result in the addition of a crown roof element towards the front of the appeal dwelling.
7. Together the totality of works proposed would result in an extremely bulky roof form that would provide the host dwelling with a rather dominant and top-heavy appearance. Additionally, the introduction of the crown roof at the front of the dwelling, alongside the alterations to the appeal property's roof previously allowed, would result in the roof form having a highly convoluted and rather disjointed design and appearance.
8. The proposal would therefore result in an unsympathetic and jarring addition to the host property, with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. This is despite the overall height of the proposed roof remaining similar to that of neighbouring properties.
9. In reaching the above view, I have had regard to the previously approved scheme, and the apparent design concerns surrounding the linking of hipped and gable end roofs. Nonetheless, I find the appeal scheme would still result in a disjointed roof form and that it would aesthetically be of greater detriment than that previously approved. I have also had regard to the precedent studies that the appellant has referred to in the surrounding area, including at no. 4 Egerton Gardens. However, the current appeal proposal is not directly comparable to these other approved schemes, as the design of the roof forms differ, whilst there are also contextual differences between the relevant host dwellings.
10. Given the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character of the host property and surrounding area, it would conflict with Policies DMP1 and BD1 of Brent's Local Plan 2019-2041 (adopted 2022). Together, amongst other matters these policies seek to promote development of high-quality design that complements its locality. The proposal would also not adhere to the advice of the Brent's Supplementary Planning Document 2: Residential Extensions and Alterations (adopted 2018), which amongst other matters seeks for alterations to roofs to be designed to complement the existing house and original street character.

## Conclusion

11. For the reasons outlined above the appeal is dismissed.

*Lewis Condé*  
INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Whilst a Certificate of lawfulness (ref: 19/3628) has also been granted in relation to a proposed double hip-to-gable end roof extension with addition of rear dormer window to dwellinghouse.