



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2019 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3231911

37A Charles Crescent, Harrow HA1 4AR

- 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 J Stygar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/0402/19, dated 28 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 April 2019.
 - The development proposed was originally described as proposed single storey mansard roof extension providing additional floor at 1st floor accessible by internal staircase, ground floor would have a kitchen/living room bathroom and a study/guest bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises an L-shaped bungalow with a distinctive monopitch roof form. The appeal property adjoins three other identical bungalows to form a H-shaped block. An identical block lies immediately to the west, with two other identical blocks situated within 100m to the northeast. All four blocks can be seen from Charles Crescent. While a variety of architectural styles can be observed within the surrounding area, these four blocks are particularly distinctive features of the streetscene due to the coherence and symmetry of their design.
 5. While the height of the proposed mansard roof extension would be modest, when combined with its depth, width and position within the roofslope of the appeal property, it would result in an overly bulky and incongruous development. When seen in the wider context, the proposed roof works would detract from the symmetry shared with adjacent properties, thereby causing an unacceptable level of harm to the coherent, distinctive appearance of the H-shaped block. The proposal would also unbalance the symmetry shared with
-

- the neighbouring block to the west and would undermine with the relationship with the two other blocks to the northeast. Furthermore, as the existing roofslope can be seen from the eastern side of Charles Crescent and Pool Road to the south, it is considered that the excessive scale and incongruous appearance of the proposal would be highly prominent within public views. The development would thereby cause an unacceptable level of harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.
6. I understand that the height of the proposal was lowered following pre-application consultation with the Council. Regardless, the proposal as shown in the submitted drawings would cause unacceptable harm to the appearance and symmetry of the streetscene.
 7. The appellant has asserted that the proposal would set an acceptable precedent for roof extensions for other H-block bungalows. However, as there is no indication or guarantee that these other H-block bungalows would ever be extended at roof-level, this consideration does not justify the proposal which would appear on its own as an incongruous feature causing harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the wider streetscene.
 8. The appellant has drawn my attention to other mansard roof forms within the surrounding area. However, as these extensions appear to be made to buildings of two or three storeys in height, these precedents are not directly comparable to the proposal and do not provide justification.
 9. It is understood that the proposal seeks to improve the living conditions of the applicant's growing family. The appellant also states that as housing is in low supply, homes should be extended to make the best use of housing land. Regardless, it is not considered that these merits nor the personal circumstances of the appellant would outweigh the significant harm which would be caused by the proposal.
 10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would cause an unacceptable level of harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of the London Plan, Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013), which generally state that development should have regard to, and respond positively to, the form and design of the local area. The proposal also conflicts with the Residential Design Guide (2010), which states that extensions should harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building and the character of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR