

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 August 2019

**by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12/08/2019

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3220049**

**60 Morley Crescent West, Stanmore HA7 2LW**

- 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 P Kulatilake against the decision of Harrow Council.
  - The application Ref P/3382/18, dated 23 July 2018, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2018.
  - The development proposed is a first floor side to rear extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. The submitted plans show the appeal property as sub divided into two properties (60 and 60A Morley Crescent West). The development relates to a first-floor side and rear extension submitted as a householder planning application. I have considered the appeal on the basis of the extension and not the sub-division of the property.

### Main issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal property is an extended semi-detached dwelling that sits on a prominent corner plot. The general design of properties within the surrounding area are similar whilst plots sizes and shapes vary. A small number of properties in the surrounding area have been substantially extended. Previously permitted extensions at the appeal property have resulted in a large spatial footprint on a relatively constrained corner plot.
5. The development would extend the property at first floor on top of these previous extensions. Despite the use of sympathetic materials and the

extension being subservient to the host property through a set back and lower ridge height the development would still be highly visible and over-dominant within the street scene.

6. I note the appellant's comments that the development would rebalance the pair of semi-detached properties. However, the combination of extensions at the appeal property would result in a development that would be significantly large and disproportionate and visually discordant with nearby properties.
7. I note the presence of other extended properties in the surrounding area. However, I have not been made aware of the individual circumstances that led to them being considered acceptable by the Council. In any case, every appeal must be considered on its own merits. The presence of other large extensions in the area does not justify the harm that I have identified.
8. In conclusion the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area contrary to Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of the London Plan (2016), Policy CS1B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) and Residential Design Guide SPD (2010) which seek to ensure high quality design and extensions that respect the host property and the surrounding area in terms of scale, design and layout.
9. For the reasons outlined above the appeal is dismissed.

*B Thandi*

INSPECTOR

**Jo Jarrett-Francis**

Appeals Officer

The Planning Inspectorate

Hawk Wing, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN

<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/planning-inspectorate>

Twitter: [@PINSgov](https://twitter.com/PINSgov)

Email: [JOANNAJARRETT-FRANCIS@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:JOANNAJARRETT-FRANCIS@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)

Telephone: 0303 4445280