



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2019

**by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 8 August 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3229757**

**20 Kynaston Close, Harrow, HA3 6TQ**

- 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 and Mrs Willis against the decision of the London Borough of Harrow.
  - The application Ref P/1124/19, dated 8 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2019.
  - The development proposed is raising gable wall and forming loft conversion.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached house, which has been previously extended with a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. The original dwelling and the side extension have hipped roofs, which are a distinguishing characteristic of Kynaston Close. However, the adjoining property at number 21 Kynaston Close (number 21) has had a hip-to-gable side extension plus a rear dormer, which the Council states, was built as permitted development.
4. The proposal is to raise the original side wall of the dwelling to form a gable and construct a rear dormer that would cover most of the original roof of the property. The appellants argue that the proposal would balance the pair of semi-detached properties, as it would be comparable to the extensions at number 21. My attention has also been drawn to other dormers on properties along Kynaston Close. However, I have determined the appeal proposal on its individual merits.
5. Policy 7.4B of the adopted London Plan 2016 seeks to ensure that new development is of high quality design. Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012 also requires development to respond positively to the local context. In addition, Policy DM1 of the adopted Development Management Plan 2013 states that proposals that are detrimental to local character and appearance will be resisted. In my opinion, these policies accord with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019. This seeks to

ensure that developments add to the quality of the area, are visually attractive and are sympathetic to local character.

6. Further guidance on house extensions is provided by way of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document - Harrow Residential Design Guide (SPD). Amongst other things, the SPD advises that extensions to dwellings should harmonise with the original building and the character of the area. It also provides guidance on the scale and design of roof alterations and dormer windows. The proposed dormer does not follow the Council's guidance, as the SPD advises that two or more separate dormers should be constructed when the extension is intended to cover the width of the original dwelling.
7. Although the proposal would, to a certain extent, be similar to the extension at number 21, it would differ significantly in appearance because of its relationship with the existing two storey hipped roof side extension. The proposed development would be highly visible from Kynaston Close and I consider it would appear awkward and incongruous when viewed against that earlier addition. The loss of the hipped roof would also appear at odds with one of the distinctive characteristics of the dwelling and the streetscene.
8. The Council also contends that the proposed extension, when added to earlier additions, would dominate and subsume the original dwelling because of the overall size and scale of the additions. Whilst I accept that the extensions would be significant in comparison to the original dwelling, I do not find that to be unacceptable as a matter of principle. However, the unacceptably harmful effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and on the streetscene means that the proposal fails to accord with the provisions of the Development Plan and with the Framework, as referred to above.

### **Conclusion**

9. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Ian McHugh*

INSPECTOR