

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2017

by H Butcher BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21st March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/17/3167068

18 Monro Gardens, Harrow, HA3 6HH

- 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 Ian Barker against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/2576/16, dated 26 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the property, and the street scene.

Reasons

3. Monro Gardens is a residential cul-de-sac formed of detached two storey dwellings. There are variations in the design of each property but they share key design features such as prominent forward projections which feature bay windows, and deep overhanging eaves. There are also, generally speaking, good gaps between the properties. This accentuates their detached nature and gives the road a spacious feel.
 4. The proposed two storey side extension would extend right up to the side boundary of the property, closing the gap between it and the adjacent property 17 Monro Gardens, which is located in close proximity to the shared boundary between the two. As a result they would appear to more or less directly abut each other. This would give a cramped appearance, which would be at odds with the general spacious character of the road.
 5. The side extension would also include a parapet wall. In practical terms it would enable the extension to directly abut the side boundary without losing any space for the overhanging of eaves within the property's curtilage. However, it would further highlight the cramped nature of the extension and would also be completely out of character with the original property, of which eaves are a key feature. Whilst longer views of the parapet wall would be obscured by neighbouring properties, at closer range it would be clearly visible in the street scene.
-

6. The Council raised concern about a lack of set back of the side extension. However, I agree with the appellant that this is not necessary given the design of the original dwelling which already includes a set back in the front elevation. The extension would therefore simply form a continuation of this. It is the proximity of the extension to the side boundary and the inclusion of a parapet wall which is harmful as set out above.
7. For the above reasons the side extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the property, and the street scene. As such it would conflict with policies 7.6.B of The London Plan (2016), CS.1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), and DM1 of the Development Management Policies (2013), and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guide (2010). Broadly speaking these require a high standard of design which protects local character. Similarly the National Planning Policy Framework sets out the importance of high quality design and that it is proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness, regardless of whether a property is subject to any special planning designations.
8. In coming to the above conclusion I noted on my site visit that there were examples of properties in Monro Gardens which had extended right up to their side boundaries but these were few in number and have not significantly altered the character of the road. They do not, therefore, justify the proposal given the harm I have found.
9. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Hayley Butcher

INSPECTOR