
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2022

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3288841

7 Brome field, Stanmore, HA7 1AA

- 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 Mrs Rama Hirani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3355/21, dated 10 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as '*Side and Rear Facing Dormer, 1 Front Facing Roof Light to Facilitate a Loft Conversion*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of 7 Brome field and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two-storey dwelling located within a residential area comprising properties of broadly similar age, type, and appearance. In common with many others, No 7 has previously been enlarged including with a first-floor side extension over an original attached garage and which projects to the rear at two-storey with a hipped roof over to match the hipped roof form of the original building. The proposal includes a rear roof dormer that would sit centrally below the ridge, and a side roof extension that would fill a void between the roof plain and a wide chimney stack that extends upwards and flush with the side elevation of the dwelling.
4. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide 2010 (SPD) contains detailed guidance for roof alterations. It recognises that side dormers can be objectionable due to their potential bulk and impact on the appearance and character of the building and street scene. To achieve visual containment within the roof slope for rear dormer extensions the SPD provides guidance on their position relative to the extremities of the roof. It goes on to state specifically that where there is a rearward projecting pitched roof the rear

roof extension (or dormer) must leave a minimum of 500mm from the adjacent valley between the main and return roof slopes.

5. The existing roof configuration at No 7 is conventional, as is its presence in the street scene and relationship with neighbouring properties. The circumstances of the appeal property are not unique and, in my view, precisely represent the circumstances where the guidance contained within the SPD is intended to apply in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and wider area.
6. The rear dormer would be set up from the eaves, down from the ridge, and in from the sides of the main roof. However, it would fail to leave any gap with the valley which runs between the rear projecting roof and the main roof slope. On the contrary, it would overlap the valley, resulting in an awkward marriage between them both. Although it would be hidden largely from sight in views from the south due to the existing rear roof extension, it would be openly seen from surrounding gardens and properties elsewhere, where it would appear discordant and incongruous.
7. The side roof addition would extend up to the chimney stack and would physically attach itself to it, thereby mitigating any benefit from it being technically set up from the eaves. Whilst the broad width of the stack would screen sight of the extension when viewed square on from the side, it would be openly seen from Bromefield to fill the void between the chimney and the roof slope. I am not persuaded that its recessed position would prevent it from appearing as an unsympathetic and incongruous adjunct to the side roof slope.
8. Neither roof addition would comply with the guidance contained within the SPD. Each would appear unsympathetic to the character and form of the existing dwelling. This would be to the detriment of the visual qualities of the area. By failing to achieve a high standard of design that would respond positively to the character of the local area without harm, the proposal would conflict with Policy DM1 of the Council's Development Management Policies 2013, Policy CS1 part B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, and Policy D3 of The London Plan 2021. For the same reasons it would conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed places.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of 7 Bromefield and the wider area. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR