



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 July 2020

by R Sabu BA(Hons) MA BArch PgDip ARB RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3244047

2 Bishop Ken Road, Harrow Weald, Harrow HA3 7HY

- 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 Nadeem Butt against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/2928/19, dated 11 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as, 'single storey front and side elevation, proposed hipped to gabled loft conversion with flat roof dormer including raising of ridge height'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to roof to form two end gables; extension to roof to raise ridge height; rear dormer; two rooflights in front roofslope; single storey front and side extension to incorporate front porch; external alterations at 2 Bishop Ken Road, Harrow Weald, Harrow HA3 7HY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2928/19, dated 11 April 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: BK/P/00, BK/P/03, BK/P/04, BK/P/05, BK/P/06, BK/P/07, BK/P/08, BK/P/09, BK/P/10, BK/P/11.
 - 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 Matter

2. While I note the description of development as stated in the application form, I have used the description from the decision notice in my decision above as it more precisely describes the proposed development.

Main Issue

3. While I note the reasons for refusal, from the evidence before me the main issue is the effect of the proposed rear dormer and single storey front extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Bishop Ken Road is an attractive residential street mainly characterised by two storey semi-detached dwellings in a traditional form. A number of nearby dwellings have

large rear dormer extensions such that this feature is part of the character and appearance of the area.

5. The proposed dormer would occupy the majority of the rear of the roof and would be set in a short distance from the ridge, sides and eaves. While I acknowledge its size, when viewed against the whole building including the proposed works such as the raised ridge and existing rear extension, the proposed rear dormer would not appear dominant or disproportionate against the host building. Furthermore, while I note paragraph 6.69 of the Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guide Adopted 15 December 2010 (SPD), given the presence of other similar dormer extensions in the vicinity of the site, it would not appear incongruous in the area.
6. The Council has not objected to the width and projection of the proposed single storey front extension. From the evidence before me I see no reason to disagree. The front extension would join the bay window without allowing a separation. However, since the bay window is shown on drawing BK/P/06 as having brick cladding at ground floor with the proposed front and side extension having a rendered exterior, the bay window would continue to appear distinct from the rest of the front elevation. In addition, since it would be viewed against the two-storey bay window and given the modest height of the front extension, the single storey front extension would not unduly detract from this feature in this particular instance. Therefore, while I note paragraph 6.35 of the SPD, the front extension would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the host building or surrounding area.
7. Consequently, the proposed rear dormer and single storey front extension would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Therefore, they would not conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan The Spatial Development Strategy For London Consolidated With Alterations Since 2011 March 2016 which among other things require buildings to provide a high quality design and complements the local architectural character. It would also not conflict with Policies CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy February 2012 and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies July 2013 which requires among other things that all development respond positively to the local context and achieves a high standard of design and layout. In addition, it would also not conflict with the aims of the SPD which seeks to achieve a consistently high standard of design and layout in residential development. It would also not conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework in this respect.

Other Matters

8. While I note the evidence relating to permitted development, this point has not altered my overall decision.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions that are necessary in the interests of certainty and to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR