



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 April 2025

by **E Heron MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/24/3354250

8A Newton Road, Brent, London NW2 6PR

- 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 S Bardhoshi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 24/1856.
 - The development proposed is erection of dormer at rear out-rigger.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for erection of dormer at rear out-rigger at 8A Newton Road, Brent, London NW2 6PR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/1856, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawings: location plan; 'site plan' (drg. no XEVA/8ANR/206 A); 'elevations' (drg. no XEVA/8ANR/204 A); 'plans' (drg. no XEVA/8ANR/202 A); 'roof plans' (drg. no XEVA/8ANR/205 A).
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing buildings.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council cited two reasons for refusal in its decision notice. The second reason referred to inconsistencies and inaccuracies in the submitted set of drawings. Planning permission for a rear dormer on the main dwelling has been granted (Council Ref 22/1570), and the appeal drawings show that. During my site visit I observed that the existing rear dormer window does not match that shown on the submitted drawings, and the roof height of the appeal site appears to be taller than the neighbouring terraced properties. The Council has opened an enforcement investigation in relation to these matters, which is ongoing. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the plans before me, not on what has been constructed on site. Consequently, my decision has focussed on the Council's first reason for refusal.
3. During the course of the appeal, the Council adopted the Residential Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document, January 2025 (2025 SPD). This has resulted in guidance referred to in the evidence being replaced by newly

adopted guidance. Both parties have had the opportunity to comment on the implications of the change. I have taken account of the most up to date, 2025 SPD in my determination.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a brick mid-terraced two-storey dwelling converted into flats. There is a pleasant cohesiveness to the street scene, due to the uniformity of the terrace rows across a wide area and the formal appearance of front elevations. The rear elevations, where visible in the street scene, contribute to this cohesive quality. They are notable for the deep rear gabled projections with central chimneys and dual-pitched roofs. Overall, the area is a relatively unspoilt suburb of Victorian character.
6. The rear of the appeal property contributes to the cohesive quality of the row of out-ridgers, despite being altered by way of a first floor white-framed glazed extension. The end gables with dual pitched roofs, is the dominant feature in this part of the street scene.
7. The proposed dormer would be positioned on the rear out-rigger of the appeal property. From oblique views on Temple Road, it would not be conspicuous as it would be positioned well back on the roof slope such that it would be largely hidden from view. From other vantage points to the rear, the dormer extension would be visible, however it would be set down from, and smaller than the dormer on the main roof slope, as well as recessed far back behind the gable, and set up from the eaves. It would therefore be a subservient, inconspicuous feature. This is the case even though such dormer extensions are not a prevailing characteristic in the surrounding area, partially due to restrictions on permitted development rights for flats. Furthermore, it would comply with the parameters set out in the 2025 SPD in respect of L-shaped dormers.
8. I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area and as such, complies with Policy DMP1 of the London Borough of Brent, Brent Local Plan (2019-2041). This policy requires new development to complement the locality in terms of scale, detailing and design, amongst other things.

Other Matters

9. The Church of St Michael is nearby and is a grade II listed building. Its significance is derived in part from its age, architectural design and contribution to the street scene. Its setting and significance are unaffected given the small scale of development, distance between the two, and lack of intervisibility.
10. The Mora Primary and Nursery School comprises a pair of formal Victorian buildings fronting Mora Road, and a large brick boundary walled play area with outbuildings. The Council considers it to be a non-designated heritage asset but has supplied little detail in this respect. I consider the building group to be a non-designated heritage asset, and its significance lies in its contribution to the Victorian urban community setting and its use aligning with the building's original

purpose. The proposal would not harm the setting of the building group despite being viewed across the boundary wall and outbuilding, due to its small domestic scale in the context of a wider terrace row, and inconspicuous presence.

10. The Council refers to a height discrepancy between the proposed roof plan and elevation, relating to the step up from the eaves of the proposed dormer extension. The elevation drawing shows an existing raised eaves height of the relevant section of the outrigger, which then brings the two measurements closely in line.

Conditions

11. I have imposed the standard time limit and list of approved plans conditions in the interests of certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring materials to match the existing building to ensure harmonious treatment such that the development would sit comfortably within the street scene.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the proposal would accord with the development plan as a whole. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

E Heron

INSPECTOR