
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2017

by J Wilde C Eng MICE

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

Decision date: 10 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/17/3177420

8 Furham Feild, Pinner, HA5 4DZ

- 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 B Ahya against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/1257/17, dated 17 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front plus side extension plus first floor side to rear extension.
-

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 dwelling is a semi-detached dwelling of distinctive design, featuring a rectangular flat roofed gable set to the front of a gambrel styled roof. The property is located on a prominent plot, and notwithstanding the existing single storey side and rear extension, it exhibits a pleasing symmetry with its adjoining neighbour.
4. The proposed development would include a two storey side extension extending nearly 4m beyond the existing west elevation. Whilst this would be set back slightly from the front elevation it would nonetheless result in the removal of the gambrel roof when viewed from the front. The roof form, as I have already found, is a distinctive feature of the host property and the pair of semis.
5. The proposed extension would also detract from the symmetry and balance of the houses by virtue of its width, and due to that width, notwithstanding the stepped down roof, would not appear subservient to the existing house. Furthermore, the pitch of the roof to the proposed one storey side extension would be at a different angle to the pitch of the main roof.
6. All of these things lead me to conclude that the proposed development would be of a poor design which would be harmful to the character and appearance of

the host property and the immediate area. There would therefore be conflict with policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies local Plan (2013), which makes clear that proposals which fail to achieve a high standard of design, or which are detrimental to local character and appearance will be resisted. There would also be conflict with policy CS 1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) which requires, amongst other things, that development should respond positively to the local context in terms of design and should reinforce the positive attributes of local distinctiveness.

7. In arriving at the above conclusion I have taken note of other extensions within the area. However in general these have not been erected on a property with such a distinctive roof form and character, and their presence cannot be taken as a compelling precedent for allowing the present appeal, which I have considered on its own merits.
8. I also note the reasons, in terms of accommodation, for the appellant wanting the proposed extension, and that the proposed development before me is a reduced version of that previously submitted. These factors do not however lead me to an alternative conclusion, and given the harm that I have identified I do not consider that they indicate that the proposed development can be considered to be sustainable.

Conclusion

9. In light of my above reasoning and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Wilde

INSPECTOR