



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 July 2023

by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/23/3319723
76 Wetheral Drive, Stanmore HA7 2HL

- 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 Ashlesha Kumar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3662/22, dated 21 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 'retained existing hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and on the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached house which originally had a hipped roof, as is common to most properties in Wetheral Drive. The house is undergoing approved works to construct two-storey and single-storey side and rear extensions. The works which are the subject of this appeal have been largely carried out. They were also the subject of a Certificate of Lawful Development (proposed) application which was refused in 2022.
4. The dormer covers much of the original rear roof of the property. It is not separated from the roof of the first-floor rear extension, but rather intersects the roof valley and extends over its ridge. Although it does not go above the main roof ridge, the dormer is not sufficiently contained within the roof slope and therefore appears bulky, incongruous, over-dominant and obtrusive in views of the rear of house, including from surrounding gardens. The dormer does not comply with the guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document - Harrow Residential Design Guide (SPD) relating to the scale and design of roof alterations and dormer windows.
5. The dominant and obtrusive form of the development is also visible from the road and appears awkward, bulky, and incongruous when viewed alongside the other additions to the property. Their combined scale and prominence overwhelm the host property. Thus, there is further conflict with the SPD which advises that an extension should have a sense of proportion and balance, both

in its own right and in its relationship to the original building and should not dominate. The use of a hipped roof on the two-storey side extension does not affect my conclusions.

6. The appellant argues that the proposal would be comparable to nearby properties which have had hip-to-gable side extensions. Whilst I saw a variety of roof level extensions in the locality, I saw none with a comparable amount of development as that carried out at the appeal property. In any event, the appeal proposal has been determined on its individual merits.
7. I conclude that the harmful effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and on the street-scene identified above is contrary to Harrow Core Strategy Policy CS1.B, Policy DM1 of the Development Management Local Plans Policies and the SPD, which together and amongst other things, seek to protect local character. There would also be conflict with London Plan (2021) Policy D3.D(11) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seek to ensure that developments add to the quality of the area, are visually attractive and are sympathetic to local character.
8. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR