



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 10 April 2024

by S Rawle BA (Hons) Dip TP Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 May 2024

Appeal A Ref: APP/M5450/W/23/3334450

51A Tudor Road, Harrow HA3 5PQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr K Satkunarajah against the decision of London Borough of Harrow.
- The application Ref is P/2247/23.
- The development proposed is hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormers and front roof lights to no. 51A.

Appeal B Ref: APP/M5450/W/24/3338054

51A Tudor Road, Harrow HA3 5PQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr K Satkunarajah against the decision of London Borough of Harrow.
- The application Ref is PL/0503/23.
- The development proposed is to convert existing roof from hip to gable and first floor side extension.

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. As set out above there are two appeals on this site which differ only in the detail of the design of the proposals. I have considered each proposal on its individual merits. However, to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated.

Main Issue

4. The main issue common to both cases is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is located within an established, predominantly residential area although there are some commercial and retail uses within the vicinity, including a row of shops at the ground floor of the appeal property and its neighbours.
6. Properties within the area are mostly of a similar style and period with a mix of semi-detached and terraced houses. Hipped roofs are characteristic of the area

and the appeal property has a hipped roof which is balanced by a similar roof form at the other end of the row of properties. When viewed from the front, this uniform and balanced roof form contributes positively to local character.

7. I observed at the site visit that many properties have had large dormers added to their rear roof slope. However, that is not the case for the row of properties that includes the appeal property. The appeal property itself and the property at the other end of the same row have had two storey rear extensions added which project out from their rear elevations. When viewed from the rear along Leighton Road, although the appeal property has been significantly extended, overall, the row of properties has a balanced appearance which also positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.

Appeal A

8. The proposal includes the alteration of the existing hipped roof to a gable. Due to the loss of the hipped roof profile to be replaced by a gable and the scale of the proposed development it would appear as a prominent and incongruous feature against the existing uniform and balanced roof form.
9. Further, although I have taken account of the fact that there is a gable end opposite the appeal site at 2a Hampden Road, the effects of the incongruous design of this element would be exacerbated by the fact that it would unbalance the roof profile of the existing row of properties which would result in one end retaining a hipped roof while at the other end it would be replaced by the proposed gable. The proposal would be highly prominent within the street. As a result, the proposal would appear disproportionate when viewed from a number of public vantage points.
10. Although as outlined above, I observed that many properties in the area have had large rear dormers added, that is not the case for the row that includes the appeal property. Further, the rear elevation has already been significantly extended. The proposed dormer when combined with the existing extensions at the appeal property would result in an excessive level of development that would result in a cluttered rear elevation. Moreover, the dormer would be set down from the main ridge line of the appeal property by a minimal amount and when viewed from the public realm, the set down would be imperceptible.
11. I have taken account of the guidance contained within the Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Design Guide (SPD) which indicates that the preferred form of roof alteration to semi-detached or terraced houses is the extension of a hipped roof to form a gable with the addition of a rear roof extension. However, the SPD also sets out that roof alterations and dormer windows should complement the original street character and not dominate buildings or impair their proportions or character.
12. Although some elements of the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area, including the front rooflights, when taken together with the existing extensions and the proposed hip to gable alteration, the proposal would result in an extension of excessive scale. Further, as the extension would not appear proportionate or noticeably subservient to the host building, the bulky design of the proposed rear dormer would disrupt the existing balanced appearance of the existing row of properties. Consequently, on this prominent corner plot, the proposed extension would dominate the

existing building and appear as an obtrusive and discordant feature in the street scene.

13. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan - The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London March 2021 (the London Plan), Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy February 2012 (HCS) and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies July 2013 (HCDMP). Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure new development comprises high quality design appropriate for its surroundings which responds positively to the local context. The scheme would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which promotes development that is sympathetic to local character.
14. The proposal would also be at odds with the guidance contained within the SPD which as outlined seeks to ensure roof alterations and dormer windows should complement the original street character and not dominate buildings or impair their proportions or character.

Appeal B

15. This proposal also includes the alteration of the existing hipped roof to a gable. Due to the loss of the hipped roof profile to be replaced by a gable and the scale of the proposed development it would appear as a prominent and incongruous feature against the existing uniform and balanced roof form.
16. Further, like for Appeal A, although I have taken account of the fact that there is a gable end opposite the appeal site at 2a Hampden Road, the effects of the incongruous design of this element would be exacerbated by the fact that it would unbalance the roof profile of the existing row of properties which would result in one end retaining a hipped roof while at the other end it would be replaced by the proposed gable. The proposal would be highly prominent within the street. As a result, the proposal would appear disproportionate when viewed from a number of public vantage points.
17. This proposal does not include a rear dormer, but rather there is a proposed first floor side extension. This would be set down from the ridge of the roof and set back from the front elevation of the host building and would therefore appear as a subservient element. As a result, notwithstanding the harm I consider the introduction of the proposed gable would have on the character and appearance of the area, the proposed side extension would not result in any additional harm and this element would have been acceptable. However, the fact that this element would not cause harm, does not outweigh the harm caused by the proposed gable.
18. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan, Policy CS1.B of the HCS and Policy DM1 of the HCDMP. Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure new development comprises high quality design appropriate for its surroundings which responds positively to the local context. The scheme would also conflict with the Framework which promotes development that is sympathetic to local character.
19. The proposal would also be at odds with the guidance contained within the SPD which as outlined seeks to ensure the roof alterations and dormer windows

should complement the original street character and not dominate buildings or impair their proportions or character.

Other Matters

20. I accept that in relation to both proposals, they would not cause harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents and that drainage and fire safety considerations could have been addressed by the imposition of appropriately worded conditions. However, these are neutral matters that do not weigh in favour of the proposals.

Conclusion

21. I conclude that the proposals in Appeal A and Appeal B conflict with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations that outweigh that conflict. Therefore, both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

S Rawle

INSPECTOR