



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2019

by Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3230008

9 Anmersh Grove, Stanmore HA7 1NZ

- 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 Mrs B Glynn against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/5644/18, dated 21 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 12 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is described on the planning application form as "Retrospection application for single storey rear and side extension including terrace."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), Harrow Residential Design Guide advises that extensions should not dominate the original building and front extensions or porches should not project significantly forward of front bay windows. The appeal concerns a two storey semi-detached dwelling with double storey bay windows at the front in a street that is characterised by such properties. The front extension, which includes a porch, projects significantly forward of the adjacent bay windows, reflecting its excessive bulk and scale in this position. As a result, it appears unacceptably dominant in relation to the host dwelling, failing to respect its character and unduly detracting from and competing with the distinctive bay windows. The readily visible front extension is, in consequence, a disharmonious feature in views from the street.
4. There are examples of front additions elsewhere within the street. Reference is made in the Supporting Statement provided with the planning application to such development at 5, 7 and 8 Anmersh Grove. The Appellant points out that the front extension at no. 7 projects forward of the addition at the appeal site. However, the original dwelling in this instance was sited closer to the street than that at the appeal site. Moreover, in all these cases the development that has taken place does not project significantly beyond the immediately adjacent bay windows of the extended property. In consequence, the relationship with the host dwelling in these cases is noticeably more harmonious and less dominant and visually jarring than that arising at the appeal site.

5. There are other properties in the street where additions project beyond the adjacent bay windows. However, there are a number with no front extensions at all and where such development has taken place, the majority of these additions do not project beyond the bay windows to a significant extent. In any event, I do not have the full details and background to any other development and do not know whether any comparable extensions have planning permission and, if so, why this was granted. It may also be that such instances precede the adoption of the Council's SPD, for example. In consequence, there is nothing to show that the Council's decision making has been unreasonably inconsistent. This matter does not justify accepting a development that has further eroded the quality of the built environment.
6. In these circumstances, it is concluded that the front extension is an incongruous and visually obtrusive feature that has harmed the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene. This is contrary to the aim of Development Management Policies Policy DM 1 A and Core Strategy Policy CS 1 B to protect local character. The proposal also fails to reflect the high quality of design sought by London Plan Policies 7.4 B and 7.6 B. The front addition is also in conflict with the SPD due to its depth and resultant overly dominant appearance.
7. I am reinforced in my view regarding the adverse impact and unacceptable nature of the development by the importance placed on design in the National Planning Policy Framework. This indicates that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve and good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.
8. There has been no adverse effect in relation to the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of adjacent dwellings with regard to matters such as light levels. However, mere acceptability in this respect does not weigh positively in favour of the appeal. The application was made because the previously approved scheme was not built in accordance with the permitted plans. The significantly greater depth of the built extension by comparison to that approved has caused the unacceptably detrimental effects identified above.
9. Taking account of all other matters raised, there are no other considerations sufficient to justify accepting the development and because of the harm that has resulted the appeal fails.

M Evans

INSPECTOR