

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2017

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 01 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/16/3161741

8 Holland Walk, Stanmore, HA7 3AL

- 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 G Gold against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3395/16 dated 12 July 2016 was refused by notice dated 9 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single and two storey front extension, first floor side extension, garage conversion and alteration to roof with rear dormer window.
-

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 host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is situated in a slightly elevated position from the road on the western side of Holland Walk, which itself rises towards the end of the cul-de-sac to the north. The surrounding area is comprised predominantly of detached dwellings which are generally positioned close together and follow the curvature of the road. A variety of property styles and designs is evident in the area although many buildings have staggered fronts or two storey front projecting elements. These features, alongside the close-knit form and the presence of street trees and vegetation in front gardens, contribute to the pleasant character of the area.
 4. The proposal includes a single and two storey front extension as well as a first-floor side extension. The proposed two storey element to the side would be set back from the original front elevation and also down from the ridge. However, the extent of this would be minimal at 300mm and the proposal would result in the main part of the dwelling having a noticeably increased width and larger bulk, despite the stagger. This would reduce the prominence of the front projection on the original dwelling which would adversely affect its character whose form is defined by its front two storey projection.
 5. I appreciate that matching materials will be used and the existing roof pitch and fenestration detailing would be replicated. Whilst these elements would be
-

harmonious with the original dwelling, the size and the siting of the two storey part of the proposal would adversely distort the character and appearance of the host property.

6. The Council have raised concerns in relation to the rear dormer failing to achieve visual containment within the roofslope. Although I recognise that this element of the proposal would not meet for example, the recommended set down from the ridge contained within the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), the dormer is however of a modest size with a pitched roof design and would sit within the proposed roofslope.
7. The proposal would result in the property being constructed up to the boundary with No. 7. Whilst this would lead to the reduction of space at first floor level, having regard to the existing high eaves of the garage and the presence of the side dormers, as well the closely spaced positioning of properties in the area, I do not consider that there would be any unacceptable impact in this regard. Furthermore, the hipped roof form would continue to provide a visual gap and space at the southern side of the building and the proposal would not affect the overall depth of the dwelling. Nevertheless, and whilst taking into account that the site is not in a Conservation Area and nor does it fall in any other special designation, I have found, for reasons set out earlier in the decision, that it would not be sympathetic to the design of the original property with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
8. The appellant has made reference to a number of other properties in the area and an appeal decision¹. Whilst some details of these referenced extensions have been provided, I am not aware of the full circumstances of those cases. In any case, I am required to determine the appeal before me on its own merits.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause substantial harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would therefore conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan, Policy CS1.B of the Council's Core Strategy and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies DPD, which seek, amongst other matters, a high standard of design and to resist proposals that would harm the character of suburban areas. The proposed development would also conflict with the SPD as well as the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), which states in Paragraph 17 that planning should seek to secure high quality design. It would therefore not be the form of sustainable development that the Framework sets out a presumption in favour of.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, including the proposal would not result in the loss of landscaping features, private amenity space or harm to neighbouring occupiers and that alterations were made following pre-application discussions, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq INSPECTOR

¹ APP/M5450/A/09/2110346