



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2019

by Mr W Johnson BA(Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/19/3233032

16a Weldon Crescent, Harrow HA1 1QT

- 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 Eric Samothrakis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/4970/18, dated 25 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 8 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Roof alterations to create 3no. dormers in the side roof slopes, with the installation of 1no. rooflight in the front roof pitch and 1no. rooflight in the side roof pitch'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the roof alterations to create 2 no. dormers in the side and rear (hip to gable) roof slopes, with the installation of 1no. rooflight in the front roof pitch and 3no. rooflights in the side roof pitch at 16a Weldon Crescent, Harrow HA1 1QT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/4970/18 dated 25 October 2018, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 16WDC-PD-A-0104 rev 07; 16WDC-PD-A-0105 rev 03 and 16WDC-PD-A-0106 rev 04.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. For clarity, I have taken the name of the appellants from the appeal form as it is more precise.
3. For clarity and precision, the description of the development in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. However, in my decision, I have amended the description of the development to more accurately reflect the proposal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance on the appeal site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The host property is a first floor flat and the neighbouring properties located on Weldon Crescent in the vicinity of the appeal site are semi-detached dwellings. The host property is constructed out of brick with a tiled roof and stone cills and lintels and is located within a row of similar designed properties, most of which have not been sub-divided like the appeal property. These properties have hipped roofs but have a small gable end detail on the outer edge of their front elevations. Currently a high proportion of properties on Weldon Crescent have dormer windows present and this makes for a distinctive feature of the street scene, as they are in a location and of sufficient number to have a material effect on the character of the road on which the appeal property is located. This includes the house adjoining the host property.
6. I note that majority of the dormers present in the street are located on the side facing roof slopes of these neighbouring dwellings and have less of a set back from the respective front elevations, and so contribute to a much more prominent pattern of extensions to the dwellings. Therefore, I attach significant weight to the properties that have dormers located on the side roof slopes, as they are a predominant design in the street, forming part of its prevailing character.
7. The appeal scheme, in comparison, by virtue of its size, design and increased set back from the front elevation, results in a less bulky addition that does not dominate the roof, appearing as a subordinate addition to the host property. Furthermore, due to a similar development on the adjoining dwelling it would be balanced in its form. Consequently, there would be no significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property, resulting from the proposal, although it would be visible in the street scene. It is noted that the facing materials on the front and side elevations of the extension would consist of hung tiles, and I consider that this would provide sufficient mitigation and could be controlled through the imposition of a suitably worded condition.
8. The other elements of the scheme, such as the insertion of rooflights on the front and side roof slope facing the adjoining dwelling, I consider to have a minimal effect on the appearance of the property. Additionally, the hip to gable conversion on the rear elevation would be similar to the one already present at the adjoining property and would not be readily visible from anywhere in the public realm. Although the Council refer to the dormers located at the adjoining property being constructed through permitted development rights, they nevertheless, form a material consideration in the determination of this appeal.
9. The appellants have referenced various appeal decisions¹ in support of their submission. However, relatively little detail has been provided regarding the particular planning backgrounds to these schemes and I do not know what evidence was before the Inspectors at the time of their decisions. Additionally, they involve properties, different in design. Consequently, I cannot be sure that these are entirely representative of the circumstances in the appeal before me. In any event all appeals are judged on their own individual merits. Accordingly, that is how I have assessed this appeal scheme.
10. For the reasons above, I conclude that the development would not have a significantly detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the appeal

¹ APP/M5450/D/17/3177155 and APP/G5750/D/17/3168144

site or the surrounding area, and hence it would not conflict with the design, character and appearance aims of Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013, Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of the London Plan 2016. Additionally, it would accord with the overall design aims of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Design Guide 2010 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

11. For certainty, it is necessary that there is a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and that the materials used in construction of the external surfaces matches those present on the host property.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed.

W Johnson

INSPECTOR