
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2021

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 September 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3275377
218 Kenton Lane, Harrow HA3 8RW

- 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 Alireza Jalalialiabadi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3071/20, dated 29 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2021.
 - The development is alterations to roof to form end gable and rear dormer; rooflights in front and side roof slopes (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council's decision letter describes the development as retrospective. It is clear from the evidence provided and my site visit that the roof alterations and rear dormer roof extension had been constructed. I shall determine the appeal on this basis accordingly.
3. I have used the Council's description of the development in reaching my decision as it more fully describes the details of the development than that given on the original planning application form. The appellant's appeal form also makes reference to the updated description. I shall determine the appeal on this basis accordingly.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached extended dwelling located in a mature well-established residential area, opposite a terrace of commercial properties. Although there is some variation in the design and style of the other properties in the area, the appeal property forms part of a row of semi-detached properties that have similar features with distinctive double projecting gabled front bay windows and hipped tiled roofs.
6. The appeal site has an extensive planning history relating to proposals to extend the property, including planning permission for a two storey side

extension with a hipped roof in 2018¹. The development entails the alterations to the previously approved scheme and involves the retention of the hipped to gabled roof extension with a raised roof over the main house and a rear flat roof dormer extension across the full width of the recently extended roof. The dormer extension is inset from the eaves and shared party wall with the adjoining property and built up to the ridge line of the host property.

7. Whilst the use of a hipped roof design over the two storey side extension assists in integrating the development with the host property, the awkward design and the appearance of the roof additions are very much at odds with the roof design of the original and adjoining dwelling and the more traditional hipped roofs of similar properties in the area. The gabled roof extension and rear dormer result in substantial bulk being added to the roof plane with only narrow peripheral parts of the sloping roof being evident.
8. These shortcomings are exacerbated by the development's position, which is visible from a number of public vantage points along Kenton Lane. The consequential harm is not in my view sufficiently resolved by the limited effect of the rear dormer extension on the street scene. In any case, the dormer extension is visible at the rear from the surrounding properties and to a more limited extent from Queens Avenue to the north of the site.
9. The development, by virtue of its scale, siting and design, fails to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and detracts from the architectural integrity of the host property. As such, I consider that the roof alterations and dormer extension result in incongruous and out-of-keeping additions that cause harm to the host property and the area. As such, I consider that the development adversely harms rather than positively contributes to the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
10. I have considered the appellant's arguments that the design and layout of the roof alterations and rear dormer roof extension have been carefully considered in order to take into account the character of the host property and the other roof extensions in the area. Whilst the use of matching materials and fenestrations assist in integrating the extension with the host property, these aspects again do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above.
11. Consequently, I conclude that the development has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It is contrary to the overall aims of Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, Core Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide 2010. These policies and guidance, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development demonstrates a high quality design that respects and responds positively to existing buildings and the local character and distinctiveness of the area.

Other Matters

12. I have considered the appellant's comments regarding the lack of formal objections from the neighbours or third parties to the development. Whilst this maybe so, this does not preclude the proper planning assessment of the impact

¹ P/2036/18

of the development on the host property and the area and is not a determinative factor on its own.

13. The appellant states that the development constitutes a sustainable form of development. I have considered the various benefits put forward by the appellant that the development brings including the scheme's high quality design, making the efficient use of land and providing additional accommodation to meet the needs of the appellant's family. While I have given them some weight, these benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified. For all these reasons, there are no other material considerations to outweigh the development plan conflicts identified.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR