
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 May 2017

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/17/3172869
61 Orchard Grove, Harrow HA3 9QR

- 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 Bharat Kerai against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/0076/17, dated 27 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 24 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is single and two storey side to rear extension; single storey rear extension; roof extensions including rear dormer; installation of two rooflights in front roofslope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single and two storey side to rear extension; single storey rear extension; roof extensions including rear dormer; installation of two rooflights in front roofslope at 61 Orchard Grove, Harrow HA3 9QR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/0076/17, dated 27 January 2017, and the plans numbered 160302-00, 160302-06-PO and 160302-08-PO, subject to the following condition: -
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans 160302-00, 160302-06-PO Site Plan as Proposed and 160302-08-PO.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Bharat Kerai against the Council of the London Borough of Harrow. That application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of development provided on the planning application form has been replaced in the Council's decision notice. From the details submitted, I am satisfied that this description is more precise and I have used it here.
 4. Extensions and alterations to the dwelling have taken place. I was able to view these at the time of my visit. However, I observed that the dormer roof extension to one side is constructed to a different design and form to that illustrated on proposed drawing number 160302-08-PO. The Council's decision notice refers to drawing numbers 160302-00, 160302-06-PO, 160302-07-PO
-

and 160302-08-PO and these are the plans and proposal that are before me, although I note that drawing number 160302-07-PO relates to a previously refused planning application (Council reference P/4954/16) and I have treated this plan as background information only. Consequently I cannot entertain the variation to the dormer roof that has taken place through this appeal. This matter, therefore, should be taken up by the applicant and the Council away from this appeal. I shall therefore deal with the issues of the case that are before me.

5. The Council's decision notice, although stating the application is refused did not set out any specific reasons for refusal upon the notice. Nonetheless, the Council's decision has been supported by a delegated report compiled to inform the Council's decision. The Council has submitted the delegated application report in support of this appeal which sets out the Council's intended reason for refusal. The appellant's Planning Appeal Statement confirms that the appellant has used the delegated application report to ascertain the reasons for the Council's decision. I am satisfied that the appellant's Planning Appeal Statement is consistent in that it deals with those matters that are of concern to the Council.

Main Issue

6. Bearing the above in mind, the main issue raised in respect of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

7. The area is characterised by two-storey semi-detached and terraced properties with long rear gardens and garages or outbuildings at the end of the gardens. The appeal property is an end of terrace dwelling. There is a large garage in the rear garden that is larger than other garages or outbuildings within the area.
8. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Residential Design Guide advises that "*roof alterations and dormer windows should complement original street character and not dominate buildings or impair their proportions or character*".
9. I observed that there are different roof styles in Orchard Grove. Some end terrace and semi-detached properties have created accommodation with the roof space and have changed the hipped roof to a gable.
10. The alterations to the roof of the appeal property has created a hip of slightly steeper pitch to that of the original hip. This, in my opinion, is a marginal change in the pitch of the side roofslope and is not appreciably different to that of the original hipped pitch or that of other hipped roofed properties within the area. This is not a significant change to the appearance of the dwelling and is not particularly noticeable in the overall streetscene and nor is the change to the original roof as significant a change as has taken place elsewhere along Orchard Grove.
11. The steeper pitch of the side roofslope has facilitated a wider rear roof dormer than would have been possible if the roof had retained its original side hip. The Council's SPD advises that 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 dormer is constructed up to the ridge and is set off the common boundary with the adjoining property. It is also set off the eaves of the host dwelling and is shown on the plans to be set off the two storey rear extension. Whilst the dormer alters the appearance of the rear roof slope, I do not consider that it is unduly prominent within the roof slope or is a disproportionate addition to the dwelling.

12. Furthermore, I observed a large flat roof rear dormer further along Orchard Grove. In view of this I do not consider the dormer would be out of context with other such development that has taken place in the area.
13. The Council is also concerned that limited rear garden space is retained following the erection of rear extensions given the proximity of the existing garage to these. I observed that the garden has been laid as patio. Whilst the resulting outdoor space is less than that of other properties in the area, I consider there to be adequate space retained to provide an outdoor living area for the occupiers of this family home for their recreational enjoyment.
14. Taking all relevant considerations into account, including the guidance set out within the SPD, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. For the reasons given above, the proposal would not materially conflict with Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of The London Plan, Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan, which seek all development proposals to achieve a high standard of design and layout and resist development that would be detrimental to local character and appearance, amongst other matters.

Conditions

15. I have considered the planning conditions suggested by the Council in light of paragraph 206 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. As the development has already taken place a standard time limit condition is not necessary. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty.

Conclusions

16. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR