

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2017

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/17/3177279

8 Woodway Crescent, Harrow, HA1 2NQ

- 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 V Rabadiya against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/1354/17, dated 23 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is a part single, part two storey side extension, two storey rear extension (demolition of garage).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I use the Council's description of the proposed development which is more precise than the application form; I note the Appellant uses the same description on the appeal form.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on, firstly, the character and appearance of the host property and the locality and, secondly, on the living conditions for neighbours.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached bay fronted dwelling with pleasing elevations and scale. It has a flat roofed rear extension and side garage and is located on the outside of a right angle bend in the road on markedly higher ground than its neighbour around this corner. The locality is one of established residential character with many broadly similar, often extended, homes coming together to form a pleasant suburban scene. The proposal is as described above and would primarily provide for additional living space, bedroom accommodation and a replacement garage.

Character and appearance

5. The Appellant has submitted this revised scheme making alterations from a past refusal of planning permission (ref P/0185/17) such that dimensions have been reduced and set-backs introduced. The result to my mind is that the
-

front elevation would look appropriate and suitably subservient to the main dwelling. However I am concerned that the scale of development along the side flank, the immediate proximity of this to the boundary and the degree of two storey massing to the rear of the existing main property would be excessive, would 'swamp' the original dwelling, and would materialise as uncomfortable over-development. The extended form would be disproportionate, overly bulky and would represent poor design which I could not condone even if, as the appellant points out, views of this element would not be widespread.

6. Policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013, Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy and Policies 7.4.B and 7.6B of The London Plan (2015) call for, amongst other matters, development to be appropriately designed for its site and setting and of a suitable scale and character. I conclude that the appeal scheme would run contrary to these policies which have similar objectives to those embodied in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010) (SPD).

Living conditions

7. The scheme would include a substantial length of two storey walling very close to the side boundary of the appeal property. This boundary is faced by the front of the house to the north-west and to a greater degree runs along its main garden area. The adjoining property and ground is around a metre lower than the appeal site. A modest degree of two storey walling along this boundary may or may not be reasonable but, as the Council puts it, the "cumulative" impact of the quantum of two storey, proximate, development being sought would be unacceptably unneighbourly. The scale of the scheme, along with ground levels and orientation, would simply be such that neighbours would feel unduly 'hemmed-in' and the planned development would be overbearing, add shadow and would be obtrusive.
8. Policies DM1, CS1.B and 7.6B referred to above and the SPD all also seek to prevent harm to the amenities of neighbours. I conclude that this scheme would run contrary to this policy objective for the reasons I have given.

Other matters

9. I sympathise with the Appellant's wish to provide increased accommodation and can see that efforts have been made to overcome the Council's previously stated concerns. Unfortunately I would deem that taken as a whole the amendments have not gone far enough for the reasons I have given. I recognise that no objections were raised by local people but I have to consider aesthetics and residential amenity for the long term and in line with prevailing planning policies. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issues identified above.
10. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered. Key objectives of the Framework are to protect and enhance the qualities of the built environment and to safeguard residential amenity and the development plan policies referred to above mirror these.

Overall conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host

property and the locality and upon the living conditions of neighbours.
Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR