



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2019

by Rachael Pipkin, BA (Hons), MPhil, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/19/3224158
24 Haig Road, Stanmore, HA7 4EP

- 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 & Mrs Bharmal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref: P/5517/18 dated 5 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'single storey side and rear extensions, hip to gable conversion, provision of rear box dormer and insertion of two roof lights on the front elevation'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr & Mrs Bharmal against the Council of the London Borough of Harrow. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matter

3. Amended plans were submitted during the application process indicating that the loft extension be excluded as the appellants considered this work could be carried out under permitted development rights. The Council did not accept these amendments to the scheme.
4. The appellant has questioned whether the loft extension requires planning permission. However, this is not a matter for me to determine in the context of an appeal made under Section 78 of the town and Country Planning Act 1990. It is open to the appellant to apply to have the matter determined under Sections 191 and 192 of the Act. Any such application would be unaffected by my determination of this appeal. I have therefore considered the scheme as originally submitted.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. Number 24 Haig Road (No. 24) is a modest, semi-detached bungalow with a hipped roof. It has an existing flat roofed rear extension and a single storey garage within the rear garden. The surrounding area is characterised by pairs of semi-detached bungalows in a similar style to the appeal property, some of which have been extended at roof level to create a gable end and rear dormers as well as single storey side and rear extensions.
7. The proposed development would convert the hipped roof to a gable end and construct a rear dormer set in from the edge of the roof. The garage would be demolished to make way for a flat roofed single storey rear extension and a side extension with a part flat/part pitched roof.
8. The single-storey rear extension would extend across the full width of the original dwelling and almost double the depth of the existing rear extension. The rear garden to No. 24 is relatively shallow and the combined depth of the existing and proposed extension would cover approximately a third of the area. The demolition of the existing garage would go some way towards compensating for the loss of garden arising from the extension. However, the size of this extension would overwhelm the original house and appear overly large when viewed from both the rear garden of the house and surrounding properties. Number 22 Haig Road (No. 22) has a similarly deep extension but this is offset from the main house and much narrower and does not have such a dominating impact as the proposal before me would. It is not therefore directly comparable.
9. At the rear, the dormer roof extension would be a large and boxy addition to the building, similar to one at Number 20 Haig Road (No. 20). While it would be set in from the newly formed gable end and the existing chimney to reduce its visual impact, it would nevertheless appear as a bulky addition and out of scale on this modestly sized single storey property when viewed from the rear. Several properties within the immediate area have rear dormer extensions but, with the exception of No. 20, these are modest in size and do not justify the appeal scheme. In the case of No. 20, the dormer is very prominent and visible within the wider area. It is an isolated example and only reinforces my concerns regarding the impact of the appeal scheme.
10. Several similar properties along this stretch of Haig Road have been extended to the side including No. 22 and as such side extensions are not out of keeping within the surrounding area. However, the addition of a pitched roof to the side extension, set back from its front elevation, would result in a discordant appearance. It would be visible from the street and it would be out of keeping with other nearby forms of development.
11. The changes to the roof shape would result in a loss of symmetry between Nos. 22 and 24, which both currently have hipped roofs. Other bungalows have been similarly altered and therefore the symmetry between adjoining pairs of properties is not a significant characteristic within the street scene. Therefore, this aspect of the scheme would not be harmful.
12. The proposed extensions would be large and bulky additions which relate poorly to the house, this would result in the house harming the street scene and this results in harm to the character and appearance of the area.

13. In conclusion, the proposed development would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy CS1B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012 and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies 2013 and Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of the London Plan 2016¹ which together and amongst other things, seek high quality design that enhances the public realm and respects local character. It would also not accord with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework. It would also not conform with the design advice set out in the Harrow Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2010 which sets out, amongst other things, that extensions should harmonise with the scale of the original building.

Other Considerations

14. An application for a Certificate of Lawful Development was refused by the Council and is now the subject of a separate appeal². This related to a single storey rear extension, which the Council had previously confirmed³ did not require Prior Approval; a single storey side extension and a roof extension. The appellants have stated that these works, for which a Certificate of Lawful Development is being sought, are essentially the same as the works for which planning permission, subject of this appeal, is being sought.
15. The appellants contend that, with the exception of the single storey side extension, the proposed works could be carried out under permitted development rights set out in the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) Order (as amended) 2015 and therefore planning permission should have been granted. The evidence before me on permitted development is contradictory and subject to a separate appeal. It is therefore of limited weight as a fall-back position in respect of this appeal.
16. The appellants suggest that they could construct a large detached building under permitted development rights without the need for planning permission. However, substantive evidence has not been provided to suggest this represents a genuine fall-back position, as opposed to a theoretical one. Consequently, I have given this very little weight in my decision.

Conclusion

17. The proposed development would be contrary to the development plan and there are no other considerations that outweigh this finding. Accordingly, for the reasons given, the appeal should not succeed.

Rachael Pipkin

Inspector

¹ The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011

² APP/M5450/W/19/3224134

³ under application Ref P/4396/18/PRIOR