



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2021

by Caroline Mulloy BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 30th July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3272682

38 Durley Avenue, Pinner HA5 1JQ

- 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 Umar Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/0122/21, dated 12 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is to create a gable end wall and rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached property with a two-storey bay and gable feature to the front. It is situated within a residential area comprised of similar properties set back from the road behind small front gardens.
4. The original property has been extended by virtue of a two-storey side extension together with a further extension to the side, single storey rear extension and a rear dormer which were allowed on appeal¹. Both the original extension and the subsequent extension have retained the hipped roof form which is a characteristic feature of properties in the street.
5. The proposal would involve alterations and extensions to the roof above the recent side extension to form a gable end wall together with a rear dormer and two rooflights in the front roof slope in order to provide additional living accommodation. Whilst the symmetry originally enjoyed with number 40 Durley Avenue (No 40) has been eroded by previous extensions to both properties, the two-storey bays, gable front features and hipped roofs, nevertheless, assist in retaining a degree of unity.
6. The existing substantial side extensions are mitigated by the hipped roof which reduces the mass and mimics the existing roof and the roof of the adjoining No 40. I acknowledge that the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2010) (SPD) states that the preferred form of roof alteration to semi-detached or terraced houses is the extension of a hipped roof to form a gable with

¹ Appeal reference APP/M5450/D/19/3226241

the addition of a rear roof extension. However, the proposed hip to gable conversion would add significant additional mass and bulk and further elongate the roof form resulting in the side extensions dominating the host property. Furthermore, the long sloping roof to the rear would appear contrived and the remaining symmetry with No 40 would be eroded. The extension would not lead to a terracing effect; however, it would narrow the gap between the appeal property and number 36 Durley Avenue (No 36) and undermine the sense of space. Consequently, the proposed hip to gable conversion would appear as an incongruous addition.

7. The proposed rear dormer would occupy a significant proportion of the roof slope of the extension with a very limited set down from the ridge. It would, therefore, subsume the rear roof slope of the side extension and fail to appear subservient, particularly when taken together with the existing dormer window to the main roof slope. The presence of the gable ended rear extension of No 36 would do little to mitigate the effects of the proposal.
8. I acknowledge that there have been a variety of house extensions and alterations to properties in the street including hip to gable conversions. Nevertheless, no details of these cases have been provided and none appear to involve extensions which are comparable to the cumulative scale of the existing and proposed extensions of the appeal proposal.
9. Overall, the combined significant mass and bulk of the hip to gable conversion and the rear dormer taken together with the existing extensions would detract from the character and appearance of the host property and fail to appear subservient. Furthermore, the mass and bulk of the hip to gable end conversion and the flank of the dormer would be visible in the street scene. Due to the intervisibility between gardens, the rear dormer would be very visible to adjacent occupiers. Consequently, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area.
10. Whilst the appeal proposal would have some benefits for the appellant in terms of providing additional space for their family, this benefit would be outweighed by the harm which the appeal proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
11. For the reasons stated, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would, therefore, be contrary to Policies D1 and D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM1 of the Development Management Local Plans Policies (2013) and the SPD which collectively seek to ensure a high standard of design for new development and respect for the character of the surroundings.
12. Conflict also arises with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) which seeks to ensure that developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons stated and taking all other considerations into account, the appeal should be dismissed.

Caroline Mulloy

Inspector