

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2016

by Helen Cassini BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/16/3159972

19 Crossway, Pinner HA5 3TP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Manish Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3204/16, dated 2 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a first floor front side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council only raised concern regarding the proposed the first floor front and side extension. No concerns were raised by the Council regarding the single storey rear extension. I shall consider the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling located in a predominantly residential area. From my observations during my site visit it was evident that the majority of dwellings within the locality are semi-detached with catslide roof features, which gives the area an overall consistent and uniform character.
 5. The Harrow Council Residential Design Guide SPD: Design and Layout Guidance for Householder Developer 6 2010 (the SPD) states that extensions should harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building and that modern front extensions beyond the established building line can disrupt the harmony and architectural coherence of the streetscape. In my view, although the ridge and eave heights would be no greater than that of the existing, and the use of sympathetic material is also proposed, the loss of the catslide roof and introduction of the first floor extension would diminish the distinctive architectural style of the appeal site.
-

6. Moreover, as the neighbouring dwelling at 17 Crossway has not been extended, the proposal would also damage the symmetry formed by Nos 17 and 19. At the first floor and roof level the pair of dwellings are identical and the catslide roof has an important part to play in the overall appearance of the dwellings. The proposal would significantly impair that balance, which would subsequently result in damage to the appearance of the dwellings. The harm would be accentuated by the fact that Nos 17 and 19 are located in a prominent position, adjacent to the junction of Crossway and Greenway, and are therefore visually prominent in the street scene.
7. Reference has been made to examples of similar extensions within the surrounding area. However, rather than providing justification for the development in question, if anything, their presence points to a need for such proposals to be carefully controlled if the character and appearance of the area is to be safeguarded. Moreover, I have little information relating to the particular circumstances of these developments and whether the circumstances are comparable to the appeal proposal. As such, a comparison is of limited relevance in this instance. I have therefore considered the appeal before me on its individual planning merits.
8. Accordingly, I therefore find that the proposal would result in material harm to the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It therefore conflicts with the design objectives of Policies 7.4, criteria B and 7.6, criteria B of The London Plan 2016, Policy DM 1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies 2013 and guidance contained within the SPD.

Other Matters

9. I have had regard to the benefit that the proposal would bring in enabling the appellant to make a more effective and beneficial use of his property, but this does not outweigh the harm that I have found.

Conclusion

10. Accordingly for the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Helen Cassini

INSPECTOR