The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2017

by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/16/3160611
Flat C & D, 62 Warrington Road, Harrow HA1 1SY

- 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 T Maklad against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
- The application Ref P/2793/16, dated 7 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2016.
- The development proposed is construction of a side and rear dormer, front roof lights and the reconfiguration of both flats to provide a better standard of living for both flats.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 62 Warrington Road forms a semi-detached two storey property sited on the corner of Warrington Road and Radnor Road which has been sub-divided into flats. These streets are characterised by a mixture of traditional terraced and semi-detached houses. Most are set back from the road, but the appeal property is sited closer to the street than most other buildings on Radnor Road. As a result the building is prominent within the street scene.

4. The adjacent property 60 Warrington Road has a large rear dormer across the width of the roof. However, the Council advise that this does not have planning permission and is currently the subject of an enforcement investigation (ENF/0272/14/P). It is not sufficient in itself therefore to alter the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, I noted a modest dormer extension at 11 Radnor Road. However, its location on the rear roof slope of the property significantly limits its prominence in the street scene. I observed therefore that the majority of roof slopes in the vicinity of the appeal site retain their uniform traditional appearance. The hipped roof of No 62 contributes positively to the traditional uniform character and appearance of the roofs of the properties in the area.

5. The proposed rear dormer would meet some of the guidance regarding rear dormer extensions within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document:

Residential Design Guide 2010 (the SPD). Nevertheless, it would be large and be located very close to the hipped roof slope. As a result the aims of the SPD to retain a clearly visible section of roof around the sides of a dormer window, including the upper corners, to visually contain them within the profile of the roof would not be met. Furthermore, it would project significantly from the plane of the roof slope. Consequently, it would appear as an unacceptably dominant and obtrusive feature within the streetscene.

6. The significant alteration to the traditional roofscape, would be further exacerbated by the proposed side dormer. Although smaller than the one to the rear it too would be sited so its top southern corner would be very close to the hipped roof slope. As a result it would be particularly obtrusive, interrupting the regular pattern to the roofs within the streetscene

7. To the rear of No 62 is a large open parking area. This together with the prominent location of the property forward of the main building line adjacent to the street means that both dormers would be overly dominant and obtrusive in the streetscene, particularly given the lack of other such roof alterations in the vicinity of the appeal site.

8. I appreciate that the proposal for a side dormer was made to overcome the harm caused by the previous proposal for a hip to gable roof identified by the Inspector in appeal ref APP/M5450/W/16/3142648. Nonetheless, I have found that the proposal would also have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area.

9. Although No 60 has a large hip to gable extension. This faces towards 58 Warrington Road rather than the highway. As a result it is not in such a prominent position as the proposed dormers would be.

10. For the reasons above I conclude that the proposal would have a considerable harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of The London Plan 2016, Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies 2013, the National Planning Policy Framework and the SPD. These require, amongst other things that development is a high standard of design that responds to local context.

Conclusion

11. I appreciate that there would be a positive benefit of the proposals in terms of improving the size of the existing flats. However, this would not be sufficient to outweigh the considerable harm to the character and appearance of the area. For the reasons set out above, having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR