



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2019

by Patrick Hanna MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/19/3227463

226 Streatfield Road, Harrow, London HA3 9BX

- 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 Dhanji Varasani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/5225/18, dated 26 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is conversion of dwellinghouse into two flats; single storey front, single and two storey side extension; first floor rear extension; rear dormer; and external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal site, as described in the appeal documentation and drawings, is a semi-detached two-storey dwelling. However, at my site visit, little of the building was evident, with significant works seemingly having taken place following submission of the appeal in April 2019.
3. The roof has been removed in its entirety, as has the attached garage. No internal walls or floors remain, with the exception of the internal party wall with the adjoining semi-detached 228 Streatfield Road. The original front elevation was still in-situ, up to eaves height and for the full width. The recently constructed walls to the rear extension, indicated as having been built under prior approval, also remain. This rear section of wall has a height that just exceeds door height, comprises full width of the rear extension, and has returns shown on the submitted plans as being 1m and 2.4m in depth. Notwithstanding these remnants of external walls, it is my view that the dwelling has been substantially demolished.

Main Issues

4. The main issues of the proposed development are the effect of converting, extending and altering the dwelling on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, and the living conditions of the occupiers.

Reasons

5. The proposal is for conversion, extensions and alterations to an existing dwelling. The dwelling no longer exists, and as such, cannot be the subject of a conversion. It would therefore clearly be inappropriate for me to allow such a proposal.
6. Given my findings, I cannot conclude further on the effects of the proposal in terms of the main issues of character and appearance and living conditions, or the matters raised by either parties in statements of case, which have been superseded by events on site.
7. Whilst I have no option but to dismiss the appeal as submitted, my decision would not prevent the appellant applying to the Council for a proposal that is accurately described.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Patrick Hanna

INSPECTOR