



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 November 2024

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/24/3351670

54 Derwent Crescent, Stanmore, Harrow, HA7 2NF

- 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 Ashraf A Q Issa against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/1670/24.
 - The development proposed is reduce bulk of rear dormer to fit sympathetically within the rear roof slope to comply and remove enforcement with Ref: (ENF/0304/23/P).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The development is described on the appeal form and the Council's decision notice as rear dormer with Juliet balcony; three rooflights to front slope. This is an accurate description of the development and I have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main issue

3. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. 54 Derwent Crescent is a two storey semi-detached house in an established residential area with a large outbuilding at the end of the rear garden. The predominant architectural style in the immediate surroundings is of brick built, mainly semi-detached houses with full height bay windows and hipped, tiled roofs.
5. The relevant policies in this case include D3 of the London Plan (2021), CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) (the Core Strategy) and DM1 of the Development Management Plan Local Policies (2013) (the DMP) which, among other things, require development to be of a high quality design. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document *Residential Design Guide* (2010) (the SPD) provides detailed advice on residential extensions, including roof alterations.
6. Planning permission was granted in 2023 for a number of extensions to the house, including single storey front and rear extensions and a single and two storey side and rear extension with hipped roof. Permission was refused in

- 2023 for alterations to the roof to form an end gable and a rear dormer. These developments have been carried out.
7. This appeal relates only to the rear dormer window, Juliet balcony and front rooflights. The Council raises no objection to the front rooflights and I see no reason to disagree with this view.
 8. The various extensions have been completed. The rear dormer window as built is approximately 5.3m wide and 3.6m wide, projecting directly from the ridge of the new gable roof. It extends close to the party wall and cuts across the line of the hipped roof of the two storey extension.
 9. The proposal is to reduce the size of the dormer to approximately 3.6m wide and 1.4m high and to set it down from the ridge and further from the party wall.
 10. I consider that the proposed reduction in size of the dormer would not result in an improvement in the appearance of the house. The different extensions relate poorly to one another and the accumulation of elements has resulted in a discordant, jumbled and uncoordinated built form which appears excessively bulky and out of keeping with the house itself and the general pattern of development in the area. The proposed dormer would be an unsympathetic addition. Although it would be less visible from the street than the existing larger dormer, it would be readily visible from the playing fields to the rear and the houses beyond.
 11. Several nearby houses have been extended, including the other half of the semi-detached pair, but have generally retained the prevailing pattern of hipped roof line and form, with the exception of No. 33 opposite. The appellant has drawn my attention to others further afield with gables and dormers, but in my view, these are unsympathetic to their host building and do not justify the dormer proposed here.
 12. I conclude that the proposed dormer would be of poor design and together with the other extensions, would have an adverse cumulative effect on the host building which would fail to respect its character. It would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the building itself and the wider area. It would be in conflict with policies D3 of the London Plan, CS1 of the Core Strategy and DM1 of the DMP and the SPD.
 13. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR