



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2016

by Caroline Mulloy BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26th September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/16/3144929

Field House, Orchard Grove, Kenton, Harrow HA3 9QS

- 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 C Mehta against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3949/15, dated 18 August 2015, was refused by notice dated 24 November 2015.
 - The development proposed is change of roof from hip to gable and loft conversion with proposed dormer to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached property located on the east side of Orchard Grove. It is divided into two self-contained flats and has an existing two storey pitched roof rear projection and a single storey flat roof rear extension. Orchard Grove is characterised by terraced properties with hipped roofs. The Council do not raise specific concerns regarding the proposed roof lights on the front elevation and from everything I have seen in submissions and on site, I have no reason to disagree.
 4. It is also proposed to gable the existing hipped roof in order to accommodate the additional residential accommodation. I noted on my site visit that the distance from the eaves to the ridge of the appeal property was high; however, the existing hipped roof narrows significantly to the ridge which minimises the visual impact of this feature. I acknowledge that the proposal would maintain the height of the existing roof; however, due to the nature of the existing roof, the proposal to add two end gables would result in a tall roof with significantly greater mass and bulk than the existing. Consequently, the proposed roof would appear disproportionate to and dominate the host property.
 5. Paragraphs 6.68 of the Harrow Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2010) states that generally dormers should be subordinate features in the roof, should not overlap or wrap around the roof hips and should
-

never rise above the ridge. The retention of a clearly visible section of roof around the sides of the dormer window, including the upper corners has the effect of visually containing them within the profile of the roof.

6. Although the proposed dormer would occupy a significant proportion of the existing roof slope it would, nevertheless, achieve the 1000mm set in from the gable end required by the SPD. However, paragraph 6.71 states that where there is a rearward projecting pitched roof, the rear roof extension (or dormer) must leave a minimum of 500mm from the adjacent valley between the main and return roof slopes. The proposed dormer would be connected to the rear projection which when combined with the scale of the dormer would result in a bulky and dominant feature which would fail to appear subservient to the host property.
7. Furthermore, an access serving a property to the rear of Field House lies to the north of the appeal site and a footpath lies to the south. Consequently, the proposed gable extensions and dormer would be highly visible when approaching in both directions along Orchard Grove and from the access and footpath.
8. Taking these factors in combination, I find that the proposal would be an uncharacteristic and incongruous form of development which would consequently harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
9. Attention is drawn to a neighbouring property which is gabled; however, I note that the roof is proportionate to the host property. The appellant points to a planning application¹ which involves the gabling of a hipped roof and a rear dormer. I note that the property in this case is semi-detached and does not have a two storey rear extension and is thus not directly comparable to the appeal property. Although the proposal may have affected the symmetry of the pair of semi's it is, nevertheless, proportionate in scale to the host property and does not dominate the street scene.
10. Attention is also drawn to numbers 62 and 79 Orchard Grove. Both cases relate to terraced properties and are not, therefore, directly comparable to the appeal property. Furthermore, I note that the height from the eaves to the ridge of the roofs in these cases is much less than that of the appeal property. None of these cases are, therefore, directly comparable to the appeal property which limits the weight which I can attach to them in my Decision.
11. I, therefore, conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Consequently, it would be contrary to Policy 7.4B of the London Plan (consolidated with alterations since 2011) 2015 which seeks to ensure that buildings, streets and open spaces provide a high quality design response. Conflict also arises with Core Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (CS) (2012) which states that proposals that would harm the character of suburban areas and garden development will be resisted.
12. Furthermore, the proposal would conflict with Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies (2013) which states that proposals which fail to achieve a high standard of design and layout will be resisted. Finally conflict would also arise with the SPD.

¹ Planning application reference P/4541/14

Conclusion

13. The proposal may have some benefits in terms of providing additional living accommodation; however, I consider that these benefits would not outweigh the significant harm which I have identified.
14. For the reasons stated above and taking all other considerations into account the appeal should be dismissed.

Caroline Mulloy

INSPECTOR