
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 May 2017

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/17/3172924
51 Mountbel Road, Stanmore HA7 2AG

- 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 Brandon Monaghan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/0074/17, dated 9 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 6 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension over existing ground floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue raised in respect of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The area, in the main, is characterised by two-storey semi-detached properties similar in their architectural design and form. The appeal site is located on a splayed corner spanning Mountbel Road and Curzon Avenue. There is an open character to the streetscene around this highway junction. I observed on site that whilst some of the dwellings at similar splayed corner locations host single storey side extensions, there is a general absence of two storey side extensions and the properties overall retain their original appearance.
 4. The proposed development would create a two-storey extension to the side of No 51 Mountbel Road on the same footprint as the existing single storey side extension. Whilst it would project beyond the building line along Mountbel Road, this projection would not be significant. Nonetheless, the proposal would create additional built form to the side of the original dwelling and substantially alter its appearance.
 5. The first floor extension would have a set back of one metre from the frontage with the roof set below the ridge of the existing dwelling. Nonetheless, the proposal would add additional bulk and mass of built development at first floor level to the side of the existing dwelling further altering its appearance. Furthermore, the proposed hipped roof would have a different, and visually
-

conflicting, roof design to that of the gable roof conversion. The proposal, despite incorporating matching material, would be an inconsistent addition to the host dwelling. This, combined with the previous alterations to the roof that incorporate a gable and large rear roof dormer, would compound the visual dominance of additions and changes to the original host property. The extension would thus be out of keeping with both the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the area and would be inappropriate for this reason.

6. The proposal, along with the existing changes to the roof form, would be prominent in views from adjoining highways. This visual harm would therefore be prevalent in public views and in the outlook from the surrounding dwellings, despite there being no change to the space around the dwelling at ground level and between existing buildings.
7. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Residential Design Guide indicates that single and two-storey side extensions are inappropriate where the property has already been extended by the conversion of a hipped to a gable roof as such development is incompatible with the design, character, bulk and appearance of the locality. I acknowledge the appellant's comment that the existing single storey extension was erected after that of the roof extension. Whilst the Council may have granted planning permission for the existing side extension this does not justify the erection of a first storey to create a larger side extension that would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
8. Although the dwelling is not listed or within a conservation area and would not harm the living conditions of adjoining occupiers, this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.
9. For the above reasons the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the area, and would be contrary to Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of The London Plan, Core Policy CS1B of the Harrow Core Strategy, Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan and the SPD. These seek extensions to respect the host building, have regard to the pattern of existing streets and make a positive contribution to the character of a place, amongst other matters. These policies also seek to resist proposals that would harm the character of suburban areas. The proposal would also conflict with the aims of paragraphs 17, 56 and 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework that attach great importance to the design of the built environment and aim to ensure that development responds to local character.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR