

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2017

by Kevin Gleeson BA MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 6 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/16/3159696

98A Rosslyn Crescent, Harrow HA1 2RZ

- 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 Mark Farmer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/2597/16, dated 27 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is refused.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey end of terrace house which is currently being converted into flats. The property is typical of others within Rosslyn Crescent with the main frontage building having a long rear two-storey outrigger which extends across much of the rear elevation and is mirrored in the neighbouring property. I observed during my visit that there was generally an absence of dormer extensions to the rear of neighbouring properties.
 4. The proposal would involve the creation of habitable roofspace for use by the first floor flat. This would be achieved through the introduction of a rear dormer and rooflights in the front roofspace. The proposed dormer would extend to the ridge height in order to achieve the necessary headroom.
 5. Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy, 2012 (the Core Strategy) requires development to respond positively to local context in terms of design whilst extensions should respect their host building. Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan, 2013 (the Local Plan) requires all new development to achieve a high standard of design and layout and to respond to local character and appearance.
 6. Policy 7.4 of the London Plan, 2015 also seeks a high standard of design and layout in all development proposals and that developments should make a positive contribution to the character of a place. Policy 7.6 states that
-

buildings should be of the highest architectural quality and be of a proportion, composition and scale which enhances the public realm.

7. The Harrow Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (SPD) states that roof alterations and dormer windows should complement the original street character and should not dominate buildings. Guidelines are provided to ensure that dormers are subordinate features in the roof through retaining visible sections of the roof around them.
8. Whilst the appellant has stated that the dormer would meet the quantifiable measures within the SPD the Council has indicated that the requirements have not been met. Based on the evidence before me I am not convinced that the proposed dormer meets the SPD requirements but in any event the proposal would dominate the rear roof slope and would not be subservient to the main building.
9. The SPD states that dormers should never rise above the ridge line. Whilst the proposed development would not exceed the ridge line, by virtue of its other dimensions it would appear bulky and overbearing in occupying a considerable amount of the rear roof slope. Because of the depth of the proposed dormer it would also have an awkward relationship with the rear outrigger from which it would be set back at an angle across the main roof slope. Being an end of terrace development I also consider that the proposed rear dormer would be visible from the street.
10. I therefore find that the proposed development would not be of an appropriate scale, bulk or appearance to contribute positively to the character of the local area. It would be overly dominant and visually intrusive in terms of the simple form of the existing property, failing to respect the architectural integrity of the host property or the character or appearance of the local area. Consequently the proposal would be contrary to Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy, Policy DM1 of the Local Plan and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and the guidance in the SPD which seek to secure high quality design which is reflective of local character.
11. The proposal would also be contrary to the objective of the National Planning Policy Framework which aims to secure good design which respects local character.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

Kevin Gleeson

INSPECTOR