



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2019

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3224486

34 Chenduit Way, Stanmore, Harrow, London HA7 3NY

- 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 Fahim Wardak against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/5374/18, dated 3 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 28 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extensions to roof to create second floor level to include the creation of a balcony with balustrade to the front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have relied on the Council's description of the development which is that subsequently used on the appeal form as this better reflects the development proposed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. After its verdant approach from Uxbridge Road, Chenduit Way gives way to modern terraced properties with generally uniform pitched roofs. While some off setting of elevations and minor steps in ridgelines offer a degree of variety, the striking feature of the terrace within which the appeal property sits is its uniform appearance and absence of existing roof alterations.
5. The roof extension would consist of a large flat roof structure which would project well above the existing ridgeline of the property and consume the majority of the pitched roof creating an unduly dominant and incongruous feature which would cause significant harm to the appearance of the dwelling and the wider terrace. Its prominence would be emphasised as the existing ridgeline is set above that on the neighbouring 32 Chenduit Way.

6. The roof extension would be clearly visible from the street and from a number of nearby properties and their gardens. Consequently, bearing in mind the considerations outlined above, it would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the area. It would, therefore, be contrary to Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of the London Plan (2016), Core Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) all of which seek good quality design and architecture and development which responds positively to the local context. The proposal would also fail to comply with the Supplementary Planning Document *Residential Design Guide* which requires that roof alterations should complement the original street character and not dominate buildings or impair their proportions or character.
7. I appreciate that other roof extensions are visible on properties to the rear of Chenduit Way. However, I do not consider these directly comparable and am not aware of the circumstances of those schemes. In any event I must consider the appeal on its own merits. The properties on Sunflower Mews incorporate flat roof features but these are not set above the main ridgeline. Further, these properties are of a completely different design and are not directly comparable to the appeal property. The benefits of providing additional living space at the dwelling do not outweigh the significant harm I have identified.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons above, the appeal is dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR