The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2017

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/16/3163041
78 Dalkeith Grove, Stanmore, HA7 4SF

- 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 & Mrs Hoffman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
- The application Ref P/4182/16, dated 26 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 October 2016.
- The development proposed is alterations and extension to form hipped roof, side and rear dormers, rooflights to front roof slope and side dormer, single-storey rear extension, first floor rear extension, external alteration.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations and extension to form hipped roof, side and rear dormers, rooflights to front roof slope and side dormer, single-storey rear extension, first floor rear extension, external alteration at 78 Dalkeith Grove, Stanmore, HA7 4SF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/4182/16, dated 26 August 2016, 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 plans: Drg Nos 1500-TP00, 1500-TP01, 1500-TP02, 1500-TP03, 1500-TP04, 1500-TP05, 1500-TP06, 1500-TP07, 1500-TP08, 1500-TP11 Revision A, 1500-TP12 Revision A, 1500-TP13 Revision A, 1500-TP14 Revision A, 1500-TP15 Revision A (Roof Plan as Proposed), 1500-TP15, 1500-TP16 Revision A, 1500-TP17 & 1500-TP18 Revision A.

    3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

    4) The roof area of the single-storey rear extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.

    5) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and

re-enacting that order with or without modification), no windows, other than those expressly authorised by this permission, shall be installed at first floor level or above in the side elevations of the development hereby permitted, facing Nos 76 and 80 Dalkeith Grove.

Preliminary Matter

2. The date of the application is not clear on the application form so I have recorded it as given on the appeal form, which is consistent with the date given for the application on the decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. No 78 is a two-storey detached dwelling located within a residential area comprising broadly similar properties in terms of style and age. The appeal property has previously been extended to one side with a two-storey flat roof extension adjacent to No 76. The appeal proposal comprises a number of elements including a new hipped roof over the existing side extension and a dormer window to the opposite side adjacent to No 80. The Council is concerned that the new side dormer would combine with the existing side extension to erode the spatial setting of the dwelling to the detriment of the street scene.

5. Contrary to the Council's view, despite the detached form of the dwellings along both sides of Dalkeith Grove, I found that the properties were fairly closely sited in relation to each other. Furthermore, I saw that a significant number had been extended and in a variety of ways, including to the sides at first floor and roof levels. As such, I was unable to detect any regular pattern or rhythm to the spacing of properties along this particular stretch of Dalkeith Grove, with its verdant and spacious qualities determined principally by the fairly wide proportions of the street and its tree lined grass verges rather than by the gaps between dwellings.

6. The original gap with No 76 has been noticeably eroded by the addition to this side. The construction of a hipped roof over would help the original extension to appear better integrated with the original dwelling and would be an improvement over the existing.

7. Paragraphs 6.66 to 6.74 of the Harrow Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), adopted December 2010, deal with roof alterations. The SPD recognises that side dormer windows can be objectionable if their bulk and impact interrupts a regular pattern in the street scene although it goes on to acknowledge that side dormers to detached properties can be acceptable, especially as an alternative to the gabling of a pitched roof.

8. For reasons already given above, I am satisfied that there is no regular pattern to the street scene of importance. The dormer adjacent to No 80 would be a subordinate feature within the side roof slope, being recessed significantly behind the dwelling's front elevation and set well above its eaves line and well

below its ridge. The space between Nos 78 and 80 would not be seriously impacted by the fairly modest scale of the dormer and as such I find no conflict with the guiding principles that are set out within the SPD.

9. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposed alterations to No 78 will not harm the character or appearance of the street scene and therefore there would be no conflict with the aims and objectives of Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) or Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) insofar as they seek to achieve a high standard of design in all development and respect for an area's local character. Neither do I find conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) or with the National Planning Policy Framework as they relate to similar matters.

Other Matters

10. I have carefully considered the views of the neighbouring occupiers at 76 Dalkeith Grove. The first floor rear extension nearest to this neighbouring property would not extend beyond the rear elevation of No 76. The centrally positioned first floor addition to the rear would be set well away from the side boundaries of the site. In neither case, including when also considering the rear dormer, am I persuaded that the additions would impact significantly upon levels of daylight to the rear facing rooms within No 76, especially given that the neighbouring property would continue to benefit from an open outlook over and towards its reasonably sized rear garden. Given the relationship of the extensions to No 76 and the orientation of these properties, the rears of which face approximately north-west, I am satisfied that there would be little impact upon levels of direct sunlight, including to the area of adjoining patio. I note also that the Council raised no concerns in this regard.

11. Although the appeal property would be noticeably altered the additions would appear sympathetic to the original form of the dwelling and in-keeping with the character and appearance of the wider locality.

Conditions

12. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area it is necessary to ensure that the new works are carried out in materials to match the existing. To safeguard the amenities of neighbouring occupiers it is necessary to restrict the use of the roof area over the new single-storey rear extension and to restrict any further windows in the flank walls of the extensions, but only at first floor level.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given I conclude that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the area. Accordingly, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR