
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2016

by Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/16/3158265

37 Earlsmead, Harrow HA2 8SS

- 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 Arfan Ahmed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/2982/16, dated 20 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a GF rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two storey semi-detached dwelling that has been extended to the rear with a two storey and single storey extensions. The site forms part of an established residential area containing dwellings that are of a similar architectural style and appearance. As the appellant points out, the site is not in a conservation area, subject of a listing signifying it is of architectural or historic merit or within flood zones 2 or 3.
4. This appeal follows an earlier scheme which was dismissed at appeal following its refusal by the Council¹. The revised scheme before me has been altered by the appellant and would extend off the existing single storey rear extension by 3 metres. It is described as a conservatory, although I note the walls to the side and rear would be rendered. The roof would be mono pitched and glazed.
5. The proposal would add to the existing built form that comprises of the original dwelling and the various extensions. While the proposal has been reduced and set back from the rear elevation of the single storey extension, it would nevertheless infill part of the patio area. This would result in the built form extending across the full width of the plot at the rear. Also, the cumulative depth of the rear extension would be roughly 7 metres, with the later 3 metres extending beyond the adjoining single storey rear extension of 39 Earlsmead.

¹ Council Application Ref: P/3233/15/4771 and Appeal Decision Ref: APP/M5450/D/15/3135958

Overall, even though a rear garden would be retained, this would amount to a sizeable addition to a modest sized semi-detached dwelling.

6. While the roof form and size of the proposal have been altered, I consider the extension would not sympathetically relate to or harmonise with the style, scale or proportions of the original dwelling and the character of the area. The proposal would, as a consequence, extend beyond the adjoining property, resulting in further unbalance of the rear elevations of Nos 37 and 39.
7. Even though the rear elevation of the appeal site is not visible from the street scene of Earlsmead, the proposal would be apparent from No 39 and from the rear garden of 35 Earlsmead. It would appear, together with the existing extensions to the property, uncharacteristically large and as such it would not be a proportionate addition to the dwelling. Thus, it would detrimentally affect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the local area. I do not therefore consider it would be a design of the highest architectural quality or that it positively contributes to the site. While the rear extension at 59 Walton Avenue is referred to, the depth of this extension is considerable less than the appeal scheme and the existing single storey rear extension.
8. For these reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would significantly affect the character and appearance of the local area. It would conflict with Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy, Policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies, Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of The London Plan, the Council's Supplementary Planning Document *Residential Design Guide* and paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies seek to ensure development is of a high quality design that reflects local context and character, particularly on semi-detached properties by ensuring extensions have a sense of scale, proportion and mass.

Other Matters

9. Although 79 Earlsmead is cited, I noted the highest odd numbered property in the road was 57 Earlsmead. Many of the photographs show side extensions which are not comparable to the appeal scheme and as no address has been provided, I attach little weight to the other rear extension shown as I cannot be sure of whether this site is in the local area.
10. The proposal would improve the appellant's living accommodation and I consider on balance the proposal would not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupants in No 39. However, the proposal would not necessarily create jobs, replace poor design with better design or result in a net gain in biodiversity. In any event such matters would not, even when the development plan is taken as a whole, outweigh the harm that would be created in terms of the character and appearance of the local area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR