
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2019

by J Gibson BUEP MPIA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/19/3235088
167 Preston Hill, Harrow HA3 9UY

- 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 Marius Solovastru against the decision of the London Borough of Brent Council.
 - The application Ref 19/1774, dated 13 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is originally described as "Proposed Double Storey Rear Extension. First Floor Side Extension (right side). Demolishing of existing single storey garage and utility room and replacing them with Double Storey Side Extension (left side). Front Porch. Alterations to the existing roof following by creation of nine dormer windows. Existing building to be rendered".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling with a single storey extension on either side of the dwelling, a projecting bay window at the front and rear, and a hipped roof. The property is located on the southern side of Preston Hill which is predominantly characterised by residential development. Immediately neighbouring the appeal property to the west is a three storey apartment building and to the east a two storey hotel.
4. Preston Hill is a busy main road and consequently the extent of development along the street scene is sporadic and varied in use and character. The street scene is characterised by a varied mix of housing and development types, ranging from large retirement homes and apartment complexes, and smaller scale terrace dwellings, detached and semi-detached dwellings. The few examples of detached dwellings present along Preston Hill achieve a consistent design and scale to the appeal property, preserving the overall form of the host dwelling with extensions appearing subordinate. Despite these variations along the street scene, the general pattern of development achieves a consistent and legible scale and design for each development type which is proportionate to the intensity of each use.

5. The appeal proposal seeks to increase the overall bulk and scale of the existing dwelling to replicate the scale and design of the neighbouring hotel. The appellant has argued that the proposal would be complimentary of the character and appearance established by the neighbouring hotel and apartment building. Whilst this is acknowledged to an extent, the proposal would detrimentally alter the character of the host dwelling resulting in a disproportionate appearance more akin to larger, more intensive use types such as the hotel and apartment building referenced. This would consequently harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling by unduly increasing the bulk of the property relative to its intended use as a family dwelling house and would interrupt the legible pattern of small scale residential dwellings in the area.
6. I note the appellant's reference to an appeal decision relating to the neighbouring hotel development. It is my view that this decision is not directly comparable to the appeal before me as that determination was based on a different use and superseded policies. In any event, I have determined the appeal before me on its own individual merits.
7. Accordingly, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy DMP1 of the Brent Development Management Policies (2016) and the Residential Extensions & Alterations SPD2 Supplementary Planning Document (2018). Collectively this policy and SPD seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that extensions to residential dwellings are of high quality which achieve a scale and design which complements the host dwelling and locality.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Gibson

INSPECTOR