



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 22 April 2025

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/M5450/D/25/3361748

141 Yeading Avenue, Rayners Lane, Harrow, HA2 9RJ

- 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 Mrs Morenike Fambegbe against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/2648/24.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extension to roof to form end gable; rear dormer, rooflights in front and rear roofslope; window in end gable; external alterations.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/M5450/D/25/3361751

141 Yeading Avenue, Rayners Lane, Harrow, HA2 9RJ

- 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 Mrs Morenike Fambegbe against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/2650/24.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extension to roof to form end gable; rear dormer, rooflights in front and rear roofslope; window in end gable; external alterations.
-

Decisions

Appeal A Ref: APP/M5450/D/25/3361748

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations and extension to roof to form end gable; rear dormer, rooflights in front and rear roofslope; window in end gable; external alterations at 141 Yeading Avenue, Rayners Lane, Harrow, HA2 9RJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2648/24, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Drg Nos GS-ARCH-FAMB-PH01, GS-ARCH-FAMB-EX10, GS-ARCH-FAMB-EX11, GS-ARCH-FAMB-PL021, GS-ARCH-FAMB-PL022, GS-ARCH-FAMB-PL023 and GS-ARCH-FAMB-PL024.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal B Ref: APP/M5450/D/25/3361751

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

3. As set out above there are two appeals on this site. They differ only in the detailed design of the proposed rear dormer. 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 in both cases is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located at the terminal end of Yeading Avenue where it extends beyond its junction with Waverley Road as a straight length of no-through road. It sits on the fringe of a residential neighbourhood and adjacent to an area of publicly accessible open space. In common with the attached property at No 139, the dwelling has previously been extended by projecting its two-storey, hipped roof form sideways. It has further single-storey extensions, including to the side where they extend up to and follow the splayed alignment of the site's side boundary. Both proposals seek to change the property's hip end to a gable and to construct a rear dormer window.
6. Part 6 of the *Harrow Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD), adopted in 2010, provides design and layout guidance for householder development. The Council objects to the proposed hip-to-gable change in both cases. They argue that it would fail to relate to the host dwelling and other buildings as an incongruous and bulky addition. However, contrary to assertions made by the Council that there are no similar extensions within the immediate vicinity, I saw many examples of hip-to-gable changes on similar semi-detached properties along Yeading Avenue and within the wider area. I counted seven such changes close to the appeal site along the short no-through road part of Yeading Avenue alone. They are very much part of the established development pattern as it has evolved. Moreover, where specifically dealing with roof alterations, the SPD states at paragraph 6.69 that a preferred form of roof alteration to a semi-detached or terraced house would be the extension of a hipped roof to form a gable with the addition of a rear roof extension (or a rear dormer window).
7. The hip-to-gable change would not appear alien within its context. Neither by simply altering the roof form to a conventional two-storey end gable would it appear excessively bulky, especially given the wide-open space that extends beyond the side of the appeal site. There would be no potential for creating any sense of terracing or loss of space between buildings. Although there would be an imbalance with the hipped roof form of No 139, this is common within the area with other examples where one half of a semi-detached pair has been altered in such a manner. Whilst the proposal relates to the roof of an already existing extension to the original dwelling, site considerations along with the existing context of the street scene, mean that the hip-to-gable change would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the appeal property or the wider street scene.
8. The Council has no objection to the proposed dormer in Appeal A. I do not disagree. It would be centrally positioned and well-contained within the rear roof slope. The dormer proposed in Appeal B would be significantly wider and deeper.

Although it would satisfy the SPD's guidelines in terms of its set-in measurements from the shared boundary with No 139 and the new end gable, and its set-back from the roof eaves, it would span a length well beyond the dwelling's original roof. By so doing it would conflict with the SPD's guidelines where it advises against a dormer that would exceed the width of one that could be created if an original hipped roof were altered to provide a gable end. In my view it would appear as a disproportionately wide and over dominant roof addition and one that would be openly seen from the publicly accessible open space to the side of the appeal property as unduly obtrusive and harmful.

9. Based on my findings, I am satisfied that the Appeal A proposal would not be harmful to the character or appearance of No 141 or the wider area. As such, there would be no conflict with Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy, adopted in 2012, or Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies, adopted in 2013, as far as they both seek to secure a high standard of development that respects local character and distinctiveness. Neither would there be conflict with similar requirements contained within Policy D3 of The London Plan 2021. Due to the harm that I have identified from the dormer proposed in Appeal B, there would be conflict in that case with all the development plan policies referenced above.
10. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, Appeal A succeeds and Appeal B fails.
11. In the event of either appeal succeeding the Council has suggested three conditions. In relation to the planning permission hereby granted, in addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is needed for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area a condition is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in materials to match the existing.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR