



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 May 2025

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/25/3359962

101 Balmoral Road, South Harrow, Harrow HA2 8TE

- 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 Mejid Awadi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application reference is PL/3074/24.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable roof extension and rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. The submitted plans show ground floor extensions to the front, side and rear of the main house that were not in place at the site visit. For the avoidance of doubt, my assessment relates to the roof level changes sought to the appeal property, to which description of development given on the completed application form refers.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end terrace 2-storey dwelling with a hipped roof within a predominantly residential area. I saw that some dwellings on Balmoral Road and nearby streets have been extended and altered at roof level, including those to which the appellant has referred and provided photographs. Consequently, there is some variety to the appearance of the existing built form within the local area.
5. The proposal is to enlarge No 101 by the extending the main roof to form a gable end with a new dormer placed onto the extended rear roof slope. The proposed dormer would have a flat roof with the top set below the main ridge. Although set in from the edges of the host roof on 3 sides, it would still be a sizeable addition.
6. From my inspection of the plans, the considerable scale and bulk of the new dormer would visually dominate the rear façade even with a sizeable ground floor extension at the side and rear in place. The overall effect would be an incongruous and over-sized addition to the host building that would detract from its intrinsic character and general appearance. While the new dormer would not be readily visible in the local street scene it would draw the eye from the rears of some nearby

properties as an overly large and bulky addition that would give the finished building an awkward top-heavy appearance.

7. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document, *Residential Design Guide* (SPD) states that dormers should generally be subordinate features in the roof. It also notes that dormer windows should not dominate buildings nor impair their proportions or character. For the reasons given, the proposal would not comply with this guidance.
8. I observed several examples of high-level extensions including hip to gable alterations and rear dormers to properties in the area surrounding the site. Few background details have been provided of these changes and so I cannot be certain that their circumstances are the same or very similar to those of the proposal. In any event, each development should be assessed on its own merits, as I have done in this instance.
9. At the front, the ridgeline would be continued to form a new gable end with new roof lights placed onto the front roof slope. While the proposal would increase the scale and alter the shape of the main roof, these changes would not be so great as to seriously imbalance the wider terrace even though the dwelling at the opposite end retains its original hipped roof form. Consequently, there would be no significant visual disharmony in the local street scene with the new gable end in place.
10. Nevertheless, I conclude on the main issue that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. As such, it conflicts with Policy D3 of The London Plan, Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy, Policy DM1 of the Council's Development Management Policies Document and the SPD. Together, these policies and guidance aim to ensure that development achieves a high standard of design and positively responds to local character. It is also at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which states that development should be sympathetic to local character and add to the overall quality of the area.
11. Once complete, the proposed extension would provide an additional bedroom and bathroom within the roof space of the dwelling. The enlarged house would better suit the family needs of the appellant with extra space to accommodate his elderly parents. I note that ground works and some vegetation clearance has taken place at the rear of the main house, to which an interested party raises concern, primarily to improve surface water drainage. The appellant is also committed to enhance biodiversity and has followed the planning process with the appeal following several applications including a proposal for an outbuilding in the back garden of No 101. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

12. Overall, the proposed development conflicts with the development plan, when read as a whole. There are no material considerations, including those of the Framework, which indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR