



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2022

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3290470

4 St Bride's Avenue, Edgware HA86BS

- 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 Raj, Roccopia Developments Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/4388/21 dated 01 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is alterations to roof to form an end gable, rear dormer. Insertion of two rooflights in front roofslope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to roof to form an end gable, rear dormer. Insertion of two rooflights in front roofslope at 4 St Bride's Avenue, Edgware HA86BS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/4388/21 dated 01 November 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to conditions set out below.

(1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

(2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: SP01, SP02, SP03, SP04, SP05 and SP06.

(3) The external facing materials to be used in the construction of the dormer and roof hereby permitted shall be roof tiles to match the existing building. The external facing material to be used in the gable elevation shall be brickwork to match the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council altered the description of development, this is also the description used by the Appellant on the appeal form. I consider this to be a more accurate description of the appeal proposal and accordingly I have adopted an amended description in the heading above rather than the appellants description of development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and host property.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached property located within a predominantly residential area. Many properties in the area have been extended or altered.
5. The Council did not raise concern with regard to the insertion of rooflights in the front roofslope, from the information before me I do not disagree.
6. The Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Design Guide (2010) (the SPD) provides an overview of design guidelines for new development. In relation to roof alterations and in particular dormers these should be set in from a shared boundary and a gable, and set back from roof eaves. The proposed development would not comply with the design guidance set out in the SPD.
7. During my site visit I observed a number of dormers to the rear of properties within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site that are of a similar scale, design and position on a property to that of the development before me.
8. Even though the proposed dormer would not align with the guidelines in the SPD and would be a substantial addition to the property, the scale of the development and materials used would not be out of keeping with the surrounding area.
9. The proposed alteration from hipped roof to gable is comparable to other properties within the area. Notwithstanding this I note that the gable is proposed to be faced in roof tiles to match the existing roof rather than the side elevation, this would be incongruous to the area. A planning condition could be attached to an approval requiring external facing materials to be used in the formation of the gable elevation to match the host property, in this instance brickwork would be appropriate and would reflect other properties in the area.
10. On this basis I find that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and host property.
11. There is no conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies Plan (2013) (the DMP) which seek amongst other things to ensure development responds positively to the character of an area and respect local form.
12. There is also no conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings.
13. The reason for refusal contends that there would be conflict with Policy DM26 of the DMP. Policy DM26 relates to conversion of houses and other residential premises and does not appear to be directly relate to the proposal before me.

Conclusion and Conditions

14. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.
15. I have imposed a standard condition relating to the commencement of development and a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty. In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area I have imposed a condition concerning materials.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR