

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2021

**by Geoff Underwood BA(Hons) PGDip(Urb Cons) MRTPI IHBC**

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

**Decision date: 17 December 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3281890**  
**90 Suffolk Road, Harrow HA2 7QG**

- 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 Paresh Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
  - The application Ref P/1512/21, dated 12 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2021.
  - The development proposed is a hip to gable roof extension with three front roof lights to a detached dwelling.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect the development would have on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

## Reasons

3. Suffolk Road is characterised to a large extent by detached houses of similar design. Like the appeal dwelling, the projecting bays of some houses present a gable to the road. However, the majority have hipped roofs on the main body of the houses, a feature which contributes to a largely consistent roofscape. Even though there is no particular designation on the local townscape, this relatively uniform arrangement creates an attractive character and appearance.
4. The proposed gable ended roof would appear harmfully at odds within the immediate context of hipped roofs on houses either side and the predominantly consistent roofscape of the wider street scene. Some other houses farther along the street have 'hip to gable' roof alterations and bulky rear dormers noticeable from the front. However, these are not so numerous as to have created a roofscape in which the appeal proposal would appear any less discordant. These examples are very much in the minority.
5. Although the slight set back on either side of the rear extension would give a limited impression of a gable, this would be minimal and do little to reduce the effect of the bulk and mass of the rear element whose flanks would be conspicuous from the street. Despite proposing matching materials, the uncompromising size and rectangular shape of the rear extension would be incongruous in the in the context of the existing hipped roof and rear 'crown-roof' extension arrangement. This effect would less prominent when viewed

from the rear due to that existing extension and intervening trees and shrubs along the garden boundary. Nevertheless, it would be noticeable through gaps in vegetation from the Yeading Walk footpath.

6. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the area, contrary to London Plan (2021) Policy D3, Harrow Core Strategy (2012) Policy CS1 and Development Management Policies (2013) Policy DM1. Together, and amongst other criteria, they require development to respect and enhance local character, and that extensions respect their host building having regard to massing, bulk, scale and roof form.
7. The proposal would also fail to accord with Harrow Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2010). Although this promotes gable roof extensions in some circumstance to accommodate dormers, it advises avoiding gabbling of existing hipped roofs on detached houses which can be unduly prominent. The proposal would not result in the visually attractive development that adds to the overall quality of the area and is sympathetic to local character that the National Planning Policy Framework expects.
8. Similar extensions may have been implemented under permitted development rights in the vicinity but, as the appellant points out, previous extensions on the appeal property appear to have prevented the same approach in this case. This does not, therefore, carry any weight in support of the appeal.
9. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area in conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

*Geoff Underwood*

INSPECTOR