



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2020

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/20/3251863 212 Headstone Lane, Harrow HA2 6LY

- 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 P Khakharia against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/0810/20, dated 1 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as the “demolition of existing dwelling and outbuilding and erection of new residential building housing 1 replacement dwelling and 5 new dwellings across ground, first and roof level with associated parking, bins, cycle storage and alteration to drop kerb”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter and Main Issue

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, the wording from the planning application form has been entered and this differs from the wording on the Council’s decision notice. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the application form which accurately describes the proposal.
3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is a detached bungalow located within a residential area containing a mixture of properties including bungalows, 2 storey semi-detached and large detached houses. The property is set back from Headstone Lane with a grassed amenity space in between. There are several trees within the grassed space and in the locality, which contribute to the areas verdant character.
5. The appeal scheme would result in the demolition of the existing bungalow and outbuilding on the site and the erection of a substantial new residential building accommodating 6 flats. I note that the design of the building has evolved to respond to comments made in respect of an earlier planning application and subsequent unsuccessful appeal.

6. The principle of the proposed development is not at dispute between the parties and on the basis of the evidence before me I see no substantive reason to reach a different conclusion. Furthermore, I note that the intensification of the occupation of the site could be in accordance with a number of national and local planning policies, as highlighted by the appellant.
7. The Harrow Residential Design Guide SPD (the SPD) identifies that the roof form of a building is an important visual element of a building and requires that new development recognise the scale, massing and roof form of surrounding buildings.
8. The appellant asserts that the proposed development has been designed with the intention of being reflective of the surrounding dwellings. However the inclusion of windows to upper section of the front gable and the large hipped roof incorporating flat sections, described by the Council as a 'crown roof', extended to the rear of the property by a dormer extension would nonetheless result in a building of some scale and bulk that would appear as a prominent and incongruous feature.
9. I therefore find by that by virtue of the quantum of the development proposed and the resultant scale and appearance of the replacement building, the proposed development would appear as a prominent and discordant feature harming the character and appearance of the area.
10. As such, the proposals are in conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies, Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy and the provisions of the SPD which seek new development to be of a high standard of design that has regard to the context of the development.
11. Furthermore, the appeal scheme is contrary to Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has referred to other developments¹ where consent was granted for a considerably larger footprint than previously existed and where a crown roof was included in a redevelopment. These examples do not persuade me as to the acceptability of the appeal scheme and in any event, I have determined the appeal scheme based on its own merits.
13. That the appeal scheme would provide additional dwellings in an accessible location is a material consideration that weighs in favour of the proposals and I attach some weight to it but it does not outweigh the harm I have identified previously.

Conclusion

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

Mark Brooker INSPECTOR

¹ 1a Cunningham Park - P/3108/18, 2 BOXTREE ROAD, HARROW, 106 Uxbridge Road; Harrow & unidentified property on Headstone Lane.