



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2019

by A McCormack BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3238307
121 Parkside Way, Harrow HA2 6DB

- 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 Rajesh Rajagopalan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/2585/19, dated 8 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is single and two storey rear extension and first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Procedural Matters

2. The original property that is the subject of this appeal was previously a wide detached house which was subsequently sub-divided to provide two separate dwellings. It has previously been extended by way of a single-storey rear extension which was complete at the time of my visit.
3. There is an extensive planning history relating to the appeal property and I have had due regard to this. As a result, I note that a previous scheme relating to the appeal property, Ref: P/4298/18, sought planning approval for a similar but larger proposal to that which is now before me. That scheme was refused for reasons of excessive bulk, rearward projection and width and poor design. The appellant says that this appeal scheme now addresses the concerns which were raised regarding that refused scheme and therefore this appeal proposal should be allowed.
4. The principle difference between this appeal proposal and the refused scheme is that the proposed first floor element has been reduced in width. As such, the appellant argues that this would result in a greater gap between its flank return and the side of the host dwelling and a greater set back from the side boundary along Pinner View. Whilst this and other differences in relation to the referenced refused scheme are noted, I must assess the proposal before me on its own merits and circumstances with regard to the planning history and all other matters as material considerations in my determination of this appeal. Accordingly, I confirm this to be my approach.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

6. The appeal property is within an established residential area where the immediate locality is characterised predominantly by two-storey semi-detached dwellings with some detached properties across the area. Although originally a detached single dwelling, the appeal property has been subdivided to form two semi-detached dwellings. As a result, the pair of properties have a different appearance to other pairs of semi-detached properties nearby and also other detached dwellings. Moreover, due to its prominent position on the corner of Parkside Way and Pinner View the original building, and host dwelling in particular, is highly visible within longer views along Parkside Way from the east, Pinner View from the south and within the general street scene.
7. From what I have seen and read, I find that due to this highly visible and prominent position, in tandem with the existing extensions, the proposed development, in tandem with the existing extensions and alterations to the original property, would result in a substantial increase in the size and scale of the host property. As such, it would appear incongruous, bulky and out of step with the form and scale of development in the immediate area.
8. The proposal would appear subservient to the existing property as the proposed roof ridge height would be lower than the main dwelling and the rear first floor extension would be stepped in from the side flank wall and site boundary along Pinner View. However, the cumulative impact of the existing and proposed extensions and alterations would create a substantial addition which would appear as a contrived over-development to the rear of the property. It would be clearly visible from Pinner View to the south and would therefore be detrimental to the prevailing and predominantly consistent character and appearance of the locality and wider street scene.
9. I acknowledge the argument that the appeal proposal has reduced the overall size and scale of the development proposal previously refused by the Council. However, in my assessment, I consider that the overall impact of the proposed scheme before me would be significantly harmful to the host property and locality.
10. The appellant states that the existing 4-metre deep single storey rear extension is not visible from many vantage points in Parkside Way and as a result its visual impact with the proposed scheme would be limited. Notwithstanding this, from my observations at the site, I find the existing extension to be highly visible from Pinner View. As such, in combination with the additions proposed, the cumulative impact of the proposal in terms of scale, bulk and visibility in the wider area would be substantial and harmful to the visual appearance and character of the original property and the prevailing character of the area.
11. Overall, I find that the design and layout of the proposed development would have a limited adverse visual impact on the property when viewed from certain points on Parkside Way. Notwithstanding this, due to its scale and positioning, its visual impact on the property and local area would be significant when viewed from various points along Pinner View. Moreover, its mass and scale would appear visually incongruous, awkward and bulky. This would be particularly apparent and harmful due to its highly visible position. Taking account of these factors, it is my view that the appeal scheme would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the property and have an adverse effect on its surrounding area.
12. Furthermore, based on the evidence, whilst the proposal would provide additional living accommodation for occupiers of the host dwelling, I find that the benefits of the scheme do not outweigh the significant weight I give to the harm identified.

13. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would have a significant detrimental effect on the character of the host property and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore, it would be contrary to Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013, the Council's adopted Residential Design Guide 2010 and Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of the London Plan 2016. Amongst other matters, these policies and guidance seek to ensure that new development respects and complements the character of the local area and has no substantive harmful impact on its surroundings.

Conclusion

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

A McCormack

INSPECTOR