



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2019

**by D Hilton-Brown BSc (Hons) CIEEM**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 24<sup>th</sup> December 2019**

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3237281 56 Longley Road, Harrow HA1 4TH**

- 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 Kotecha against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
  - The application Ref P/2306/19, dated 22 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2019.
  - The development proposed is for a hip to gable roof alteration including rear dormer extension.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for alterations to the roof to form an end gable and rear dormer; installation of three rooflights in front roofslope and a new window in the side, at 56 Longley Road, Harrow HA1 4TH. This is in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2306/19, dated 22 May 2019, 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: 144/PL 01 Rev:A; 144/PL 02 Rev:A; 144/PL 03 Rev:A; 144/PL 04 Rev:A; 144/PL 05 Rev:A; 144/PL 06 Rev:A; 144/PL 07 Rev:A; 144/PL 08 Rev:B; 144/PL 09 Rev:A.
  - 3) The development shall not progress beyond damp proof course level until details of the materials (or appropriate specification) to be used in the construction of all external surfaces, have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority to be agreed in writing.

### **Procedural Matter**

2. The Council altered the description of application P/2306/19 to read; 'Alterations to roof to form end gable and rear dormer; installation of three rooflights in front roofslope and new window in side.' This is also the description used by the appellant on the appeal form. I consider this to be a more accurate description of the proposals and I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.

### **Main Issue**

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development, by virtue of the design and materials used, on the character and appearance of the host

property and the immediate area.

## **Reasons**

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached residential dwelling located on the northern side of Longley Road, with front and rear gardens and a single storey rear extension.
5. The proposal would change the existing hipped roof to form an end gable with the installation of a rear dormer, one side window and three rooflights in the front roofslope.
6. The bricks and tiles in this proposed development would match the host property, while more contemporary materials would be used in the rear dormer. These would consist of aluminium powder coated insulated panels for the dormer cheeks and dark grey aluminium framed windows. These are designed to match the existing ground floor extension. The size and siting of the dormer would ensure that it achieves visual containment and remains subservient within the rear roofslope.
7. Planning permission has already been granted (P/5654/17) on a joint application for rear dormers on both Nos 54A and 56. The design, scale and materials of this approved scheme are very similar to this appeal. They also include the powder coated metal cladding on the dormers that have been cited as a reason for refusal in this case.
8. I acknowledge the Council's argument that this case is different in that it relates only to No 56. However, the principle of development and the use of these materials has already been accepted by granting planning approval. Additionally, the metal cladding has been designed to match and complement the existing rear extension, thereby matching and blending in with the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
9. I have also taken into consideration that this previous planning permission was subject to a condition to ensure that these dormers were not built separately. However, this was because the proposal did not include the 0.5m gap between the dormer cheeks and the shared boundary as required in the Residential Design Guide<sup>1</sup> (RDG). This would have resulted in a cramped appearance on the boundary if only one of the pair was constructed.
10. This appeal proposal would include this 0.5m gap between the dormer cheek and the neighbouring property of No 54A, thereby complying with the RDG. Furthermore, the condition referenced above, did not relate to the use of metal cladding on the dormers. The metal cladding was considered acceptable in this approved scheme and no condition relating to materials was required.
11. Additionally, the RDG does not preclude the use of a contemporary modern design and that it may be appropriate in some circumstances. In this case it would be acceptable as it would match the existing contemporary design of the rear extension.
12. The development would not be visible from the public streetscene. There would be some exposure to the rear, however, this would be limited to adjacent

---

<sup>1</sup> Harrow Council, Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Design Guide, Adopted 15 December 2010.

properties only. It was evident from my site visit that dormers were present on the neighbouring properties of Nos 50, 58 and 60. These extensions varied in design, size and the type of materials used. The use of metal cladding would therefore not be a prominent feature and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area, thereby complying with the RDG.

13. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the immediate area by virtue of the design and the materials used. Consequently, the development complies with Policy 7.4B of the London Plan<sup>2</sup>, Policy DM1 of the Local Plan<sup>3</sup>, the RDG and paragraph 127 of the Framework<sup>4</sup>. Together, these require that development achieves a high standard of design and layout, which is not detrimental to the local character and appearance.

### **Conditions**

14. In addition to the statutory implementation condition, it is necessary to impose conditions. These require details of the materials, or appropriate specification to be used to ensure a high standard of architecture and construction and to specify the plans in the interest of certainty.
15. I have not included drawing Nos 144/PL 11 Rev:A and 144/PL 12 Rev:A in the list of approved plans, as they are photographs relating to the character of the area and not relevant to construction. Additionally, the Council requested that samples of the materials should be submitted. However, I consider that conditioning details of the materials to be used are sufficient in this case, as it is not within a conservation area or within the curtilage of a listed building.

### **Conclusion**

16. I conclude that the appeal should succeed, and planning permission should be granted subject to the above conditions.

*D Hilton-Brown*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>2</sup> The London Plan, Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011. March 2016.

<sup>3</sup> Harrow Council, Development Management Policies, July 2013.

<sup>4</sup> Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government, National Planning Policy Framework, February 2019.