



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2026

by **D Marley BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/25/3376113

291a Flat 1, Northolt Road, South Harrow, Harrow HA2 8HX

- 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 R Zahini of Avro Buildings Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/0423/25.
 - The development proposed is use of first and second floor as self contained (3 bed) flat; alterations replacing single pitch roof with double pitch roof; rear dormer; refuse and cycle storage; external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for use of first and second floor as self contained (3 bed) flat; alterations replacing single pitch roof with double pitch roof; rear dormer; refuse and cycle storage; external alterations at 291a Flat 1, Northolt Road, South Harrow, Harrow HA2 8HX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/0423/25, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: AP001 A, AP125 C, AS325 C, AE215 C.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until full details of refuse storage and cycle storage have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and the refuse storage and cycle storage retained thereafter.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council's objection on the main issue relates to the retention of a rear dormer. The Council does not maintain an objection on the main issue to other elements of the proposed development and following my site visit I see no reason to disagree.
3. The application form identifies that development has commenced. However, both parties agree that the proposed development seeks to make certain alterations to the existing building which does not, in its current form, have planning permission. I have therefore determined the appeal based on the plans before me. That said, it is clear both from the submitted information and my site visit that parts of existing development would accord with the proposed plans including, specifically, the section of rear dormer proposed for retention. I have therefore made reference to the partly retrospective nature of development in my decision.

4. I have used the Council's description of development as it more accurately describes the development to which the appeal relates.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is located along a rear access lane. The appeal site includes an outrigger, alongside a dormer set above the outrigger and below the main roofline. At my site visit I noted that the buildings and associated outriggers in proximity to Whitby Road appeared to retain much of their original form. By contrast, the roofline and roof structures of buildings along the access lane in proximity to the appeal site were less coherent. Close to the appeal site along Wargrave Road is a large three storey building, which includes a mansard roof structure alongside a parapet facing towards the appeal site. My attention has been directed to an existing dormer on a separate property on the access lane, which on the evidence before me may be smaller in scale than the dormer at the appeal site, though also set above the roofline of the associated outrigger.
7. The proposed development would in effect retain the existing dormer, and would reinstate the pitched roof on the outrigger. The outrigger at the appeal site would be altered, however the dormer would continue to extend approximately the full width of the outrigger, be set slightly below the roofline of the main building and set in from the edge of the roof boundary on one side.
8. Whilst the buildings and their outriggers in proximity to Whitby Road retain a degree of architectural coherence, this is not the case for the appeal site and other structures in proximity to Wargrave Road. Given the wide variety in appearance, scale and form of development, and the effect of the different design approach taken in the 3-storey building on Wargrave Road, the built environment in proximity to the appeal site does not display a consistent or coherent design approach. As such, the roof dormer would be perceived as part of a diverse mix of elevational and roof treatments. Therefore, although the roof dormer may be larger than other dormer structures along this section of lane, the dormer would not appear out of place within the street scene.
9. Given the reinstatement of the pitched roof of the outrigger, the proposed dormer would be perceived in the context of the main roofline. Whilst the main roof would not be visible around all corners of the dormer, sufficient roof structure would be visible such that the dormer appeared subservient and visually contained to the main roof.
10. Whilst the dormer is visible from some public and private viewpoints, and would likely remain so following the completion of the proposed development, neither the bulk or mass of the dormer is of such extent that it either currently appears, or would appear, either obtrusive or overbearing, and would thus not appear out of place or harmful to the street scene.
11. I acknowledge that the dormer exceeds the guidelines set out within the Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guide (2010) (the 'SPD') in terms of size and roof visibility. Nevertheless, I have not identified harm arising

from the dormer in this particular context and as such I afford the conflict with the SPD limited weight.

12. As a result of the above matters, the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposed development would therefore comply with the relevant provisions of Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policy CS 1 of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012 and Policy DM 1 of the Development Management Policies 2013. Amongst other matters, these policies require development proposals to respond to local context and character, and to have regard to massing, bulk, scale, height and appearance.

Other Matters

13. The Council's statement makes reference to a perceived conflict of the upper floor accommodation with space and quality standards. However, other evidence within the Council's submission identifies that the proposal provides an acceptable internal layout. This matter is not identified within the reason for refusal, and on the evidence before me I see no reason to conclude the proposed development would not provide adequate and appropriate internal space.
14. Whilst reference has been made to other dismissed appeals within the Borough relating to roof dormers, I have limited information before me with regards the nature and circumstances of these appeals. I have determined the appeal on its individual merits and, given the information provided, these appeals have not led me towards an alternative conclusion on the main issue.
15. I have had regard to a previously allowed appeal at the site relating to a change of use to a dental practice and residential use. The main issues considered at this appeal related to the effect of that appeal scheme on living conditions and with regards the effect of the proposed materials on character and appearance. As the Council has not raised an issue with the material treatment of either the dormer or the proposal more broadly, neither of the matters considered at the previous appeal are a main issue in this appeal. As such, this previous appeal has not led me to an alternative conclusion on the main issue.
16. Interested parties have raised concerns with regards the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers including with regards to privacy, outlook and natural light. Concerns have also been raised with regards the size and scale of the overall proposal, matters related to materials, whether the proposal would provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers with regards private outside space, and certain matters of fire safety. The Council has not raised an objection with regards these matters and following my site visit I see no reason to take a different view. Equally, whilst general concerns have been raised with regards crime in the area, I do not have substantive evidence before me with regards local crime rates nor measures related to the proposed development that may be necessary in this regard.
17. Whilst interested parties have raised concerns with regards the provision of cycle storage, I consider that such matters can be adequately managed by condition.
18. Concerns have also been raised that allowing the appeal would result in an undesirable precedent in the consideration of future planning applications. Whilst I recognise the importance of consistency in the planning process and that like cases should be decided in a like manner, I have determined this appeal on its

individual circumstances and on the basis of the evidence before me, and have not found that harm would arise. As such, I am satisfied that my decision would not harm the ability of the Council to exercise its judgement in future cases.

19. Whilst comments have been raised relating to land ownership, there is no substantive evidence before me to suggest the appellant does not own the land subject of the appeal nor that development could not be accommodated within the area shown on the plans. The Council have also raised no concerns in this regard. In any event, matters related to land ownership are a separate matter and do not therefore alter my conclusions with regards the planning merits of the appeal.
20. Equally, whilst reference has been made to previous acts of development that may have been undertaken without planning permission, I have assessed the appeal on its own merits and have found no conflict with the development plan. I have also had regard to a previously upheld enforcement appeal at the site, however on the evidence before me the main issue in that appeal related to the period of compliance set out within the enforcement notice. These matters therefore weigh neutrally in my decision, and matters relating to enforcement are for the Council.

Conditions

21. As both parties agree that development has commenced and I see no reason to take a different view, it is not necessary to impose the standard time limit condition. In the interests of certainty, I have imposed a condition requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
22. Given the partly retrospective nature of the development, the Council do not consider a condition requiring matching materials to be necessary, and following my site visit I see no reason to take a different view. In addition, whilst the location of the existing bin and cycle store is shown on the plans, I do not have full details before me with regards the arrangement and adequacy of the existing situation. I have therefore imposed a condition requiring the submission and implementation of full details of bin and cycle storage.
23. Whilst the Officer Report makes reference to a potential condition related to fire safety management, I consider the appellant's submitted information sufficient to demonstrate the proposal would be acceptable in this regard. Given this, on the evidence before me, such a condition would not be necessary or reasonable.
24. The Officer Report also makes reference to a condition requiring the removal of certain existing ground floor windows. These windows are not included on the approved plans and may not on the evidence before me have planning permission. As such I do not consider a condition requiring their removal to be necessary.
25. Equally, whilst reference has been made to a condition to require Secure by Design principles to be implemented, I have not been directed to specific requirements related to the development proposed nor has substantive harm been identified in the absence of such a condition. In light of the above and my findings on the evidence before me, I do not consider such a condition to be necessary.

Conclusion

26. The proposed development would accord with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed.

D Marley

INSPECTOR