



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2024

by R Sabu BA(Hons), MA, BArch, PgDip, RIBA, ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/24/3339493

Flat 2, 62 Wellesley Road, Harrow HA1 1QN

- 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 B Deol at Properties 4 You Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/0142/23.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extension to roof to form end gable; wrap-a-round side to rear dormer to create habitable roofspace for first floor flat (1x3 beds); two rooflights in front roofslope; external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations and extension to roof to form end gable; wrap-a-round side to rear dormer to create habitable roofspace for first floor flat (1x3 beds); two rooflights in front roofslope; external alterations at Flat 2, 62 Wellesley Road, Harrow HA1 1QN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/0142/23, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than [three] years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos 2023151.PA109 Rev P01, 2023151.PA105 Rev P02, 2023151.PA104 Rev P03 and 2023151.PA102 Rev P02.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building/dwelling.

Preliminary Matters

2. I note the consultation version of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) and Written Ministerial Statement made in July 2024. Given the scale of the proposal, these have not altered my overall decision.
3. While I note the description of development in the decision notice, I have used the description in the application and appeal forms in the banner and decision above in the interests of certainty.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. Wellesley Road primarily consists of two storey terraced and semi-detached houses in a traditional style that give the area a pleasant residential character.
6. No 62 Wellesley Road (No 62) is at the end of a terrace and the proposal includes alterations and extensions to form end gable and wrap-a-round side to rear dormer as well as roof lights in the front roof slope.
7. The rear of the properties near No 62 appear to be largely unaltered at roof level except for a couple dwellings, including adjacent to the site. The adjacent building benefits from a similar wrap-a-round dormer extension to that proposed such that the proposal would not appear discordant in comparison. While I note the planning history of the dormer at the adjacent building, it nonetheless forms part of the character of the terrace.
8. The part of the proposed dormer on the main part of the building would be largely screened by the outrigger when viewed at ground level. The part of the dormer above the outrigger would be set back from the rear wall by a sufficient distance such that it would not visually dominate the host building. The proposal would therefore not harm the character and appearance of the host building.
9. Wellesley Road and the properties to the rear of the street have long narrow rear gardens. Therefore, the proposed dormer extensions would not appear prominent from most of the surrounding rear gardens and properties as it would be screened by boundary fences. In addition, while rear dormers are uncommon along the road, as the site lies at the end of a terrace and adjacent to a property with a similar scheme, the proposal would not visually disrupt the character of the terrace or area.
10. The proposed dormer would be only slightly set in from the gable end and roof eaves and would extend up to the shared boundary with the adjacent property. Accordingly, while the proposal would not strictly accord with the guidance in the adopted Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (December 2010) (SPD), as it would not dominate the host building or impair the character of the wider area, the scheme would not conflict with its aims.
11. As the opposite side of the terrace has a gable end, the alteration of the roof to form an end gable at the site would not harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposed rooflights in the front slope would not appear prominent from ground level and would not adversely affect the character of the property or surrounding area.
12. Consequently, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the proposal would not conflict with Policy D3 parts D1) and D11) of The London Plan The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London March 2021 (London Plan), Policy CS1 part B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM1 of the Development Management Plan Local Policies (2013) which together seek development that enhances local context and responds to the existing character of a place. The scheme would also not conflict with the aims of the SPD and Framework in this respect.

Other Matter

13. I note the evidence regarding the lawfulness of the dormer extension at No 68 Wellesley Road. However, it is nonetheless present and for the reasons given above, does not alter my overall decision.

Conditions

14. Conditions relating to time limits and specifying plans are necessary in the interests of certainty. A condition regarding external materials is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR