
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2017

by David Cliff BA Hons MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/16/3162465

6 Kelvin Crescent, Harrow HA3 6DP

- 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 Mrs K Stirrup against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3323/16, dated 8 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is 'replace tiles with K render finish'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. In the statement of case the appellant seeks to revise the proposal to replace the existing tiles with dark PVC cladding, instead of render. This would amount to an amendment of the appeal proposal and would appear to result in a materially different nature of development to that considered by the Council in its determination of the planning application. Furthermore, the proposed revision is not reflected in any amended drawings. If I were to determine the appeal on the basis of this revision it is possible that the interests of parties who might wish to comment would be prejudiced¹. I therefore have considered the appeal on the basis of the development proposed in the original application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling located in a prominent position within Kelvin Crescent. Whilst some properties in the road have had alterations to their front elevations, the majority have retained tile hanging whilst others have what the appellant has described as New England style cladding.

¹ Annexe M of the Procedural Guide Planning Appeals – England advises that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and it is important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially what was considered by the local planning authority, and on which interested people's views were sought. It also states that if any applicant thinks that amending their application proposals will overcome the local planning authority's reasons for refusal they should normally make a fresh planning application.

5. From my observations at my site visit, whilst there are some design differences between properties, I consider there to be a collective cohesiveness and attractiveness to the overall appearance of the properties. This has a positive effect upon the existing streetscene and the character and appearance of the area. Whilst the appellant states that the majority of tiled frontages are in a poor state of repair, dirty or broken, this has not been evidenced and is not obviously apparent.
6. The appeal proposal for a rendered finish at first floor level would be at odds with the prevailing appearance of properties within Kelvin Crescent. Taking account of its prominent position, the use of render would result in the dwellinghouse appearing as unacceptably incongruous within the streetscene.
7. The appellant draws attention to the use of yellow render at no.12 Kelvin Crescent but I find the effect of the appeal proposal would be significantly more pronounced in its impact on the streetscene.
8. I also note that the proposal is sought as the appellant states that the existing tiles are in a poor state of repair and in need of replacing, with several at risk of falling. There is no detailed evidence before me concerning the severity of the risk of any tiles falling. In any case it seems to me that it would be possible to provide a replacement elevation material that would be more in keeping with the streetscene than the proposed render finish. There is also no evidence before me to substantiate the claim that the cost of replacing tiles is prohibitive. I have therefore given only modest weight to these considerations.
9. The proposal would result in unacceptable harm upon the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to the relevant design aims of policies 7.4B and 7.6B of the London Plan 2016, policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Harrow Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Design Guide 2010.
10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cliff

INSPECTOR