
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2017

by Richard McCoy BSc MSc DipTP MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 30 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/17/3173088

55 Morley Crescent East, Stanmore HA7 2LG

- 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 Dipak Pattni against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/5646/16, dated 30 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey side extension, conversion of garage into habitable room and associated internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. No. 55 is a semi-detached house occupying a wedged shaped site close to a bend in the road. The surrounding area is characterised by semi-detached dwellings, similar in style to the appeal site property, some of which have been extended to the side.
 4. Proposed is the demolition of an existing lean-to side garage and front porch, and the erection of a single storey side extension under a flat roof, incorporating a front porch. I note the Council considered that the proposal would not harmfully change the living conditions of the occupiers of adjacent dwellings in respect of overlooking, overshadowing and loss of outlook, and from my assessment I have no reason to disagree.
 5. However, the proposal would increase the width of the front elevation of the host (excluding the garage) by around 50%, rising to a height of around 3 metres. In my judgement, notwithstanding the appellant's claim that the street-scene view of the appeal site is limited, this would result in a disproportionate, incongruous form of development. In particular, the proposed flat roof would lack the elegance of the lean-to roofs of the demolished garage and porch which were more in keeping with the character of the host and street-scene. The resulting development would introduce a
-

discordant feature within the street scene as it would fail to respect the character, appearance and proportions of the host and nearby dwellings.

6. Accordingly, by reason of its excessive width and appearance, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies 7.4.B and 7.6.B of the adopted London Plan 2016, Policy CS1.B of the adopted Harrow Core Strategy, Policy DM1 of the adopted Harrow Development Management Policies and the advice in the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document *Residential Design Guide* 2010.
7. My attention was drawn to nearby developments claimed to be similar. However, their presence would not be a justification for a further development that I consider would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. This consideration would therefore not outweigh the conflict with the development plan.
8. In addition, appeal decision ref. APP/R5510/D/14/2212925 was drawn to my attention wherein a side extension to a dwelling was allowed. This relates to a development in another London Borough for which I do not have the Inspector's full considerations before me. It appears however to concern the closing of a gap and I therefore do not consider it to be directly comparable to the site specific circumstances of this case.

Conclusion

9. While I find that the proposal would not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, in my view this is outweighed by the harm the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the area. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard McCoy

INSPECTOR