

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 April 2017

by **R W Allen B.Sc PGDip MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 21 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/17/3170190 **5 Silverston Way, Stanmore HA7 4HS**

- 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 Vincenzo Ruggieri against the decision of The London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/5569/16, dated 29 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is retrospective planning application to retain as built part single part double rear extension and conversion of roof space into habitable room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. While the proposed development before me encompasses a number of extensions to the property, the Council's concerns relate only to the proposed, and as built, dormer window addition in the rear roof slope. As no other representations are before me which raise any other concerns, I am content to deal only with this matter in my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the dormer window on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property has been considerably extended to the side and rear, most recently through the grant of planning permission (*Council Ref: P/2933/15*). That permission allowed the property to construct, amongst other things, two small dormer windows, one in the original rear roof space and one in the extended rear roof. I agree with the Council's initial assessment that the smaller dormer windows would, along with the other additions, appear subservient to and harmonious with the property and its roof.
 5. I find that the proposed dormer window as built is poorly designed, and its intersection with the extended roof is both awkward and clumsy in appearance. I also find that the dormer window by reason of its size dominates the rear roof of the property notwithstanding the appellants' assertions in respect of perceived compliance with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 2010 entitled 'Residential Design Guide' (SPD). Furthermore, the addition of
-

the larger dormer window has in my judgement resulted in a tipping point being reached, whereby the original dwelling has been subsumed and overwhelmed by its numerous extensions, and this addition has unbalanced the original dwelling.

6. As the proposed dormer window is unseen from any vantage point along the street aside from a glimpsed view of a side fascia when viewed close to the junction between Silverston Way and Marsh Lane, I do not find it causes any significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. However, for the reasons given above, I find the character and appearance of the original dwelling has been significantly harmed by the size and design of the dormer window, and this is sufficient for me to find against the proposal.
7. The proposed development would not accord with policies 7.4 (b) and 7.6 (b) of the London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011) 2016, with policy CS1 B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, and with policy DM 1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies 2013, all of which require development to achieve a high standard of design. It would also not accord with the relevant parts of the Council's SPD.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Allen

INSPECTOR