

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2016

by Jameson Bridgwater DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22nd November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/16/3155270

5 Clamp Hill, Stanmore HA7 3JS

- 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 and Mrs Kaye against the decision of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/1472/16 was refused by notice dated 27 May 2016.
 - The development is described as 'proposed first floor front extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. Clamp Hill is a residential street which is suburban in character. The houses in the area are predominantly large detached and two-storey, set within generous plots. The houses are constructed from a variety of materials, but in the main, from render, with many retaining their original timber fenestration. The majority of the properties have private off street parking and generous rear gardens. The space between the dwellings, materials, fenestration and prominent roofs contribute to character and appearance of the area.
 4. Number 5 is a large two-storey gable fronted property set back from the road. The property already has a small flat roofed feature at first floor level facing the street; the appellants are proposing to extend this forward to increase the size of their bedroom.
 5. I have carefully considered the appellants' representations in relation to the variations of design in the street scene, the proposed use of matching materials and the 1.8m set back from the front elevation. However, the proposed flat roofed extension would project forward towards the street and this would result in it being highly visible. As such, when compared to the main roof of the host dwelling and the prevailing hipped and gabled roof forms that characterise the area; the flat roof of the proposed extension would appear incongruous and unsympathetic. Consequently, this would result in material harm to the suburban character and appearance of the host dwelling and the immediate area.
-

6. Having reached the conclusion above, the proposed first floor front extension would therefore conflict with Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy, Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan. These policies amongst other things seek to ensure that new buildings and extensions relate to their setting to protect and enhance local character. In reaching my conclusions I have also taken into account the Harrow Residential Design Guide SPD (2010).

Conclusion

7. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jameson Bridgwater

INSPECTOR