

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2017

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) MCD DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 6 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/16/3164050

19 Hillbury Avenue, Harrow, Middlesex HA3 8EP

- 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 & Mrs Paresh & Anju Popat against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3675/16, dated 11 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is proposed two storey side, single storey front & rear extension, roof over gable, rear dormer and roof lights on front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached house that has previously been extended. At roof level rear and side dormers have been added. The shape of the property's hipped roof is still evident although the adjoining house, No 17 has been altered so that it has a gable roof and a two storey side extension. The adjacent house, No 21 has a hipped roof. There are various alterations to the houses in Hillbury Avenue including properties that have altered hipped roofs to gable roofs and a variety of two-storey extensions. The most prevalent and original style of house however, are hipped roofed semi-detached houses.
 4. Whilst I accept that the proposal would create a degree of symmetry between the pair of semi-detached houses i.e. Nos 17 and 19 this does not overcome my concerns about the overall bulk and design of the proposal. Whilst the first floor of the two storey side extension would be set back from the front elevation of the house, the combined roof alteration and the added extension would harm the original character and appearance of the property. Although the original property has previously been altered I find the proposal excessive and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area generally.
-

5. The requirement for high quality design runs through national and local policy in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework¹, Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan² and Development Management Policy DM 1³.
6. DM 1 in particular indicates that proposals which fail to achieve a high standard of design or which are detrimental to local character and appearance will be resisted. Core Strategy Policy CS 1⁴ also clarifies that proposals that would harm the character of suburban areas will be resisted and all development should respond positively to the local context in terms of design, siting, density and spacing; extensions should respect their host building. Further guidance is also provided in the Council's Residential Design Guide⁵.
7. Given my concerns about the design, bulk and impact of the proposal especially combining the alteration to the shape of the roof, the two storey extension and the large rear dormer, the proposal would conflict with these policies and therefore is unacceptable.
8. The neighbour at No 21 has expressed concern about the loss of light caused by the proposed two storey extension. Whilst there may be some impact I do not consider this sufficient to add to the concerns I have already expressed. I have considered this matter together with other matters raised but these do not alter my conclusion. I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area in conflict with the policies referred to above and therefore the appeal fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

¹ Department for Communities and Local Government National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012.

² Mayor of London The London Plan The Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011, March 2016.

³ Harrow Council Development Management Policies, July 2013.

⁴ Harrow Core Strategy, February 2012.

⁵ Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guide, Adopted 15 December 2010.