



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 March 2025 by S Wilson LL.B. MSc MRTPI

Decision by Mr A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/24/3358265

50 Plympton Road, London NW6 7EQ

- 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 James Smith against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 24/2156.
 - The development proposed is new dormer to rear roof slope including adjustments to existing dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. During the application process the description of development changed from that stated on the application form. I have not been provided with any confirmation that this change was agreed by the parties. Therefore, I have used the original description which is, in any case, sufficient for the purposes of identifying the works to which the appeal relates.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling with particular regard to its location within the North Kilburn Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. Plympton Road consists of three groupings of three storey terraced properties that demonstrate the pattern of classical design and Arts and Crafts decorative style that is prevalent in the surrounding North Kilburn Conservation Area (CA). The CA Appraisal (CAA) recognises the classical design, intricate detailing, and classical proportions, amongst other things, as features that contribute to the significance of the CA and notes that its quality can be significantly damaged by the loss of historic detail.

6. Each group has slight variations of detailing and form. The odd numbers on one side of Plympton Road form two distinct groupings with slight, but distinctive differences in detailing between them and are separated by the junction for Streatley Road. The even number side of Plympton Road is one long terrace; however, even here there are differences to the rear elevation outriggers roofs and slight variations to the offset cat slide rear dormers between Nos 2-18, 20-22 and Nos 24-60.
7. Nos 2-18 have two-storey simple pitched roof rear outriggers, and the cat slide dormer is incorporated into the rear façade, breaking the eaves line. This is distinctly visually different from Nos 20-60 which have a two-storey flat roofed outrigger, and the cat slide dormer is purposefully set above the eaves line of the roof. Nos 20 and 22 are very slightly different again with the cat slide dormer in the roof above the eaves line but only one sash window width. As such, I consider Nos 2-18, 20-22 and 24-60 different elements within the same grouping.
8. The rear elevations of Nos 24-60 Plympton Road have a notable uniform pattern. The roofscape is particularly well preserved with a repetitive, rhythmic pattern of cat slide dormer windows with dual sash windows located in the simple pitched roofs and above the eaves line. As such the rear roofscapes of Nos 24-60 Plympton Road contribute positively to the character and appearance of the CA.
9. The proposal would demolish the existing cat slide dormer and introduce two offset dormers in its place, one above the other. It is acknowledged that the proposal would accord with aspects of the guidance contained within the North Kilburn Conservation Area Design Guide.
10. Nonetheless, the two proposed dormers would be wider than the original, created by means of an uncharacteristic third sash window. The increase in mass would jar against the pleasant consistency of the roofscape, diminishing the contribution of the uniformity of the rear elevations. The provision of a further, higher dormer would introduce uncharacteristic form and mass into the rear roofscape that would disrupt the pleasant rhythm of the uniformity, drawing attention away from the rhythmic pattern of the roofscape and adversely affecting the character of the host building and diminishing its contribution to the character and appearance of the CA. Whilst the appeal proposal would not be widely visible from the public realm, it would be visible from other properties within the CA.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to other rear roof dormer developments in the vicinity. In some cases, I have not been provided with any substantive detail of those developments and as such I cannot be certain against which development plan and policies those developments were considered or if they even have permission at all. Regardless, they are all located outside of the subject appeal grouping. As such I attribute them little weight.
12. I have been provided with detail of dormer extensions at numbers 28A Callcott Road, 23 Plympton Road and 29C Plympton Road. However, from the evidence before me, those developments appear to be different to the appeal scheme in terms of scale, mass and bulk, and which appear to relate to single height dormers rather than the proposed double height dormers as is the case in the appeal scheme. Consequently, the circumstances do not appear to be comparable to the scheme before me.

13. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas. Given the scale and location of the proposed development, the harm to the significance of the CA would be less than substantial in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework). Nevertheless, it is a matter of considerable importance and weight. I am required to balance this harm against the public benefits of the proposal.
14. The proposal would adversely affect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and consequently neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the CA. In this instance, the public benefits associated with the proposal, to include employment opportunities during construction, would be very limited in nature and would not outweigh the harms identified above. Accordingly, while the proposal would accord with some of the guidance contained within the North Kilburn Conservation Area Design Guide, the proposal would fail to comply with Policies DMP 1, BD1 and BHC1 Brent Local Plan (2019-2041) and the relevant paragraphs of the Framework, insofar as they seek high quality design that respects local character and preserves or enhances the historic environment.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Mr A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR