



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 August 2025

by **M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/W/25/3367318 **207C Chevening Road, London NW6 6DT**

- 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 David Goatman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application reference is 24/3409.
 - The development proposed is alterations to an existing dormer window, the installation of an inset roof terrace, and the installation of 2x rear rooflights to the first- and second-floor flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to an existing dormer window, the installation of an inset roof terrace, and the installation of 2x rear rooflights to the first- and second-floor flat at 207C Chevening Road, London NW6 6DT in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 24/3409, 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 the following approved drawings and documents:
 - 2777-PL-01 Rev C (Site, existing, and proposed plans)
 - Design, Access and Heritage Statement (Squire Heritage Consulting, 12 November 2024)
 - 3) Where they have not otherwise been specified in the application or in the approved drawings and documents, the external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match the appearance of those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development used on the planning application form included a reference to a previous planning application. As that is not descriptive of development, I have instead based the wording in the banner heading and my formal decision above on that used on the appeal form and the decision notice issued by the Council; it provides an accurate and more concise description of the scheme.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Queens Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a flat on the top two floors of a three-storey terrace property on the north-western side of Chevening Road. The proposed development is the replacement of the existing box dormer on the rear roof slope and the creation of a roof terrace, as well as the installation of two rooflights.
5. The site is within the Queens Park Conservation Area (“the QPCA”), and I have a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, the National Planning Policy Framework (“the Framework”) states that they should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance (paragraph 202). It goes on to advise that any harm or loss requires clear and convincing justification (paragraph 213) and that any harm that is less than substantial must be weighed against the public benefit of the proposal (paragraph 215).
6. The QPCA was originally designated in 1986, and comprises Queen’s Park, a short distance along Chevening Road from the appeal property, and its surrounding residential neighbourhood. The 2013 Queens Park Design Guide (“the Design Guide”) describes the park as “an excellent example of a Victorian urban green space and [...] the perfect complement to the high-quality built environment that surrounds it”. Dwellings are predominantly laid out in rows of two- and three-storey Victorian and Edwardian terraces, though there are also some semi-detached villas. Architectural details and composition are varied but of high quality, and there is a general consistency of building scale, form, and massing. It is from this coherence and quality that I consider the significance of the QPCA, insofar as it relates to this appeal, is derived.
7. Much of Chevening Road is characterised by relatively large red brick two-storey semi-detached houses, set back from the pavement with generous front gardens; their front elevations are generally articulated with extensive moulded rubbed brick detailing. The terrace including the appeal property was added to the conservation area in 2024; it features full height projecting canted bay windows with fish scale slates to their roofs, and stone pedimented porches with foliate capitals. It makes a positive contribution to the streetscape and the quality of the QPCA.
8. The 2013 Queens Park Design Guide (“the Design Guide”) provides a variety of advice in respect of dormers and other roof alterations. The Council’s particular concern is that the terrace means that the dormer would not be of a traditional style, and so would not comply with advice that dormers “should be in keeping with the style and proportions of the existing house and windows”. There is no dispute that the dormer would fall within the parameters the Design Guide sets out in respect of positioning on the roof slope and size.
9. Rear elevations of properties throughout the QPCA are generally less finely detailed than front elevations, reflecting their lower status, and they display a greater variety in part as a result of alterations and extensions over the years. Nevertheless, whether they are visible from public vantage points or only from private spaces, they contribute to the character and setting of the area.
10. The rear of the appeal property can be seen from passing trains and from the platforms of Brondesbury Park station. The terrace as a whole already includes several rear dormers, with no obvious consistency of size or design, though I

acknowledge that these pre-date the block becoming part of the conservation area, and none has an external terrace. To that extent therefore, the proposed roof terrace would be a “non-traditional” feature. The proposed doors would be taller than the existing windows, but the submitted drawings show that both they, and the terrace area itself, would be set behind and screened by the lower part of the roof slope. Furthermore, the use of timber for door and window frames would be more in keeping with the traditional materials of the appeal property and the wider area than the uPVC ones they would replace. The dormer would also be smaller than the one it would replace, so it would be less bulky and intrusive.

11. The Council raised no objections in respect of the proposed rooflights, and I agree that they would be acceptable. Overall, I consider that the dormer and terrace would tend to be assimilated into the roofscape at the rear of the block, and find that the development would not cause harm to the appearance of the host property or the surrounding area.
12. Accordingly, I conclude that the character and appearance of the QPCA would be preserved, and its significance as a designated heritage asset would not be harmed. As such, the proposed development would comply with Policies DMP1 and BHC7 of the 2022 Brent Local Plan which, among other things, seek to ensure that development is designed, sited and detailed, and is of a scale and type, to complement the locality, and that significance of heritage assets is conserved. The proposal would also comply with the requirements of the Framework relating to conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Other Matters

13. The Council’s 2025 *Residential Extensions and Alterations* Supplementary Planning Document provides general guidance for those types of developments; it notes that it can be difficult to introduce balconies or roof terraces without negatively impacting any neighbouring properties in terms of overlooking. In this case, the Council considered that, given the depth and setback of the proposed terrace, views from it would be comparable to those from the existing rear dormer. Based on everything I saw during my site visit, I find no reason to take a different view on these points.
14. The appellant (and, indeed, the original description of development) referred to a planning permission granted in 2006 for a development described as “alterations to existing dormer window to rear roof slope in order to create an inset roof terrace and installation of two rear rooflights”¹. I do not know the extent to which this appeal is the same as that approved in 2006. However, given the changes in the development plan since then, as well as the fact that the appeal property has been absorbed into the QPCA in the meantime, I agree with the Council that the earlier permission carries, in itself, very little weight in favour of the appeal scheme. My decision has been reached based on the specific planning merits of the proposed development in its current context.

Conditions

15. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans so as to provide certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area I have also included a condition requiring materials matching the existing

¹ LPA Ref: 06/2196

dwelling to be used for the development, where these have not already been specified.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

M Cryan

Inspector