



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020

by B Davies MSc FGS CGeol

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3240333

8 Murray Crescent, Pinner, HA5 3QE

- 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 Paul Solomon against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3632/19, 12 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is 'alteration of main roof from hip to gable style. Insertion of dormer in rear roof slope to form new roof (sic) in the Loft'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Several of the drawings are inaccurate, including omission of a rear window, first floor dimensions and mislabelling. However, none of these inaccuracies have a bearing on my decision, so I have proceeded to reference the submitted drawings.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons

4. The house is semi-detached and of distinctive architectural style, with a tiled mansard roof and curved overhanging eaves, and a two-storey bay window with flared brick and tile detailing. As a pair, the houses are not symmetrical, but notably for this proposal reflect each other in their roof design, curved eaves and overall balance. They are located in a small cul-de-sac off Murray Crescent comprising three semi-detached houses, which do not entirely conform to the wider street, which is characterised by mainly detached houses of straight rather than curved design, most of which have retained their hipped roofs. The other two pairs in the cul-de-sac are of significantly different finish to the host house, but all have retained distinctive roofs when viewed from the public domain.
5. It is proposed to convert the roof from hip to gable, primarily to allow access to a new rear dormer window. This design does not reflect any of the distinctive

curved architectural lines on the host house and would appear a bulky and incongruous addition when viewed from the public domain. It would also be markedly out of balance with the adjacent property and the other houses in the cul-de-sac, to a harmful degree. I therefore find conflict with Policy DM1 of Harrow Council Development Management Policies (2013), The Harrow Core Strategy (2012) Core Policy CS1.B and Policy 7.4B of the London Plan (2017), which together require that development responds positively to the local and historical context in terms of design, reinforcing the positive attributes of local distinctiveness, and that extensions should respect their host building and the context provided by neighbouring buildings.

6. The Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010) has been adopted and I therefore give it substantial weight. I note that Section 6.69 states 'the preferred form of roof alteration to semi-detached...houses is the extension of a hipped roof to form a gable with the addition of a rear roof extension (or a rear dormer window)'. However, Section 6.66 states that roof alterations should complement the original street character and not dominate buildings or impair their proportions or character, which these proposals would. On balance I do not consider the guidance in Section 6.69 outweighs the conflict with local policies identified above.
7. I note the appellant's statement that the existing extension has mansard walls with adjacent flat roof, which bears no relation to the existing hipped roof of the original house. Regardless of the original design, the current pair of houses are well balanced with complementary mansard roofs and I do not consider that a proposed gable end would have a better relationship with the mansard walls, as suggested.
8. The occasional box dormer and hip to gable conversion was observed further along Murray Crescent. However, in most of these examples, the house is detached, and the roof has been lifted on both sides and a sense of balance retained, which would not be the case here as it is semi-detached. In addition, the host house is distinctive for its curved architectural detailing, which makes the building less amenable to a sharply linear extension than others in the area.

Conclusion

9. For these reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

B Davies

INSPECTOR