



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2019

by A Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/18/3212849

26 Imperial Drive, Harrow, HA2 7LQ

- 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 G Rustemaj against the decision of London Borough of Harrow Council.
 - The application Ref P/2600/18, dated 6 June 2018, was refused by notice dated 16 August 2018.
 - The development proposed is Conversion of dwelling to two flats (1 x 2 bedroom and 1 x 3 bedroom); single storey side extension; alterations to roof to form end gable; rear dormer; two rooflights in front roofslope; widening of vehicle access; separate amenity space; landscaping; parking; bin / cycle storage; external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the conversion of dwelling to two flats (1 x 2 bedroom and 1 x 3 bedroom); single storey side extension; alterations to roof to form end gable; rear dormer; two rooflights in front roofslope; widening of vehicle access; separate amenity space; landscaping; parking; bin / cycle storage; external alterations at 26 Imperial Drive, Harrow HA2 7LQ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PP/18/01747, dated 6 June 2018, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule below.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a typical 'metroland' semi detached property within an area of similar properties. The property fronts onto Imperial Drive and has a bow fronted two storey bay window facing the road. To the rear there is what appears to be an original out-shot, two storey rear extension that protrudes into the back garden alongside a single storey, flat roof kitchen extension. The rear garden adjoins other rear gardens of similar properties.
4. The proposed dormer extension is intended to supplement other modifications to this semi detached property as described above, most notably through the alteration to the roof to change from a hipped roof to gable form on the side elevation. The Council have raised no objections to these other matters and I see no reason to revisit this issue.

5. After having inspected the site, I notice that there are several similar dormers, within the immediate vicinity. I do not consider that the appearance of such structures has caused harm to the character and appearance of the area.
6. Notwithstanding this Policy 7.4b of the London Plan 2016 and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies 2013 (the DMP) seek to achieve good design and recognise the important contribution that roof designs have upon the overall character and appearance of an area. The policies also acknowledge the role of good design in the preservation of such important characteristics and suggest that proposals should complement and not dominate buildings. Such design considerations are also reflected in policy CS1B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012 (the Core Strategy) which also seeks to achieve high quality design that it responsive to its context and the character and appearance of an area.
7. Paragraphs 6.68 and 6.70 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document in the form of the Harrow Residential Design Guide SPD (adopted 15 December 2010) also provides clear guidance as to the design of dormer extensions and provide specific dimensions within which proposed dormer extensions should fit. The guidance makes specific reference to the need for dormer extensions to be contained and subordinate within the roof, mainly through the provision of enough space left free from development around the edges of a proposed dormer.
8. The appellant has confirmed that the dormer will meet the physical dimensions required within the Harrow Residential Design Guide SPD and, subject to condition 7 outlined below, I consider that the proposed dormer will be suitably contained within the roof form in light of this.
9. Moreover I consider that the first floor rear extension roof would further visually shield the proposed dormer to the scheme's benefit and would lessen its overall visual impact.
10. Taking into account the proposed size, scale and design of the property and its location nearby to similar roof alterations at neighbouring properties, I consider that the proposed dormer would be adequately contained within the roof form of the property and would be complementary to the overall character of the area. As a result the proposal would meet the Council's design guidance for roof extensions and would not represent an inappropriate addition to the area, or adversely affect the character and appearance of the locality.
11. Therefore I consider that the proposed dormer would be a suitable addition and not result in significant harm to the property or its environs. As such the proposal would not conflict with Policy 7.4b of the London Plan 2016, Policy DM1 of the DMP, or policy CS1B of the Core Strategy.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions proposed by the Council in the light of the requirements of the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. As well as the standard time condition for the commencement of development compliance with the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. I have also included a condition with regards to materials in that they should match those of the existing house. This is in order to maintain the character and appearance of the area.

13. For the avoidance of doubt as to what is permitted I have imposed a condition ensuring that the face of the proposed dormer is set away from the eaves line by the distances required in the Council's SPD.
14. Due to the change of this property from single dwellinghouse to two flats I consider that the special justification to restrict Permitted Development Rights as included in Schedule 2, Part 3, Class L exist.
15. Screened storage of refuse bins is necessary in order to ensure the appearance of bins does not adversely affect the appearance of the street scene and to protect public health. The provision of storage of cycles is necessary so as not to preclude future residents from owning and using a bicycle should they so wish.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all material planning considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Graham

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
- 2) Except as required by condition 7, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: KS/2017/01 rev. A, KS/2017/02 rev. A, KS/2017/03 rev. A, KS/2017/04 rev. A, KS/2017/05 rev. A, KS/2017/06 rev. A
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall be used for Class C3 dwellinghouse(s) only and notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no development within Schedule 2, Part 3, Class L shall take place.
- 4) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
- 5) The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the bin storage facilities have been provided in accordance with details to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The facilities shall then be retained throughout the lifetime of the development.
- 6) The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the cycle storage facilities have been provided in accordance with details to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The facilities shall then be retained throughout the lifetime of the development.
- 7) Notwithstanding the approved plans, the face of the dormer shall be set back 1m from the existing roof eaves in accordance with the appellants email dated 2 March 2019.