
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2020

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/20/3244638

31 Uxbridge Road, Stanmore HA7 3LH

- 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 Mrs Duxha Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/4182/19, dated 9 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and first floor front extension; single storey side extension; first floor side extension; alterations to roof to form front gable, two front dormers and one rear dormer, conversion of garage to utility/plant room; external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the Council's description of the development in reaching my decision as it more fully describes the details of the development than that given on the original planning application form. The appellant's appeal form also makes reference to the updated description.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property at No. 31 Uxbridge Road (No. 31) is a large two storey detached dwelling located in a mature well-established residential area. Uxbridge Road is characterised by large detached properties of different styles and design set back from the road within large spacious landscaped plots that provides an open and verdant character in the area.
5. The appeal site has an extensive planning history relating to proposals to extend the property. The appeal proposal would entail the construction of a first floor front extension and part two storey/part first floor side extension that would project out broadly in line with the existing front elevation of the host property and would be built up to the common shared side boundary with the adjacent two storey property at No. 29. The existing hipped roof would be replaced with a wider, crowned hipped roof with a new front gable, two pitched

roofed front dormers and a single flat roofed rear dormer in order to create additional living accommodation in the roof space. The proposal would also involve the conversion of the garage to utility/plant room with a small single storey flat roofed extension at the rear and external alterations.

6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide 2010 (SPD) states that extensions should be subordinate to and harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building and the character of the area. Paragraph 6.8 of the SPD specifies that two storey side extensions should be set back a minimum of 1m from the front wall of the house and stepped down below the roofline in the order to retain the symmetry and rhythm of the original building, by reducing the bulk and avoiding a terracing effect in the streetscene. The SPD also indicates that the effect of alterations to the roof form needs careful consideration, and that roof alterations and dormer windows should complement the original street character and not dominate buildings or impair their properties or character.
7. The appeal property is on a relatively spacious plot and as such the extensions would not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size. Although the proposed two storey side and first floor front extension would extend the front of the appeal property, the degree of projection would not appear excessive due to the staggered built form along the Uxbridge Road and would generally be in line with the building line established along the frontage of the adjacent properties at Nos. 29 and 29A.
8. Equally, the closing of the gap at first floor level between Nos. 29 and 31 would not appear out of character. From my site visit I noted a number of properties in the road appear to have been built to the side boundaries or in close proximity to such. The reduced space between the extended house and adjacent property would be offset to some degree by the open parking area and mature landscaping along the frontage of the appeal property in this case. Furthermore, in elevational terms, I do not see the use of the dormer windows in conjunction with the gable extension as proposed on the front elevation nor the small single storey flat roofed extension at the rear as being materially harmful to the appearance of the property or undesirable in the streetscene in this suburban area.
9. The scale and form of the part two storey/part first floor side extension and the new crowned hipped roof would nevertheless still be a significant addition relative to the main property. As such, although set down at roof level with a comparable ridge height to the existing property, the proposed side extension, combined with the first floor front extension and the enlarged crowned hipped roof, would result in substantial bulk at the side and over the main dwelling that would be out of character with the more modest traditional form and appearance of the host building.
10. The proposed large single rear dormer would also result in a material alteration to the property's hipped roof. Whilst it would be set back from the eaves and ridgeline of the new crowned hipped roof over the property, the proposed creation of a single flat roofed dormer would be very much at odds with the traditional form and appearance of the hipped roof and the existing smaller scale pitched roof dormers on the host building.

11. These shortcomings would be exacerbated by the proposal's position, where the proposed side extension and roof alterations would be visible from a number of public vantage points along Uxbridge Road and to a more limited degree from Jellicoe Gardens to the rear, including the rear dormer. The proposed side extension and roof alterations, by virtue of their scale, siting and design, would fail to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property. As such, I consider that the proposed development would result in incongruous and out-of-keeping additions that would cause unacceptable harm to the host property and the area.
12. I have considered the appellant's arguments that the design and layout of the proposed development have been carefully considered in order to minimise any adverse impacts on the host property and the area. However, whilst the use of matching materials and fenestrations together with the landscaping and the boundary treatment would assist in integrating the proposal with the host property and the area, these aspects do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above.
13. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed part two storey/part first floor side extension, new crowned hipped roof and rear dormer would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. The proposal would be contrary to the overall aims of Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of the London Plan 2016, Core Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013 and the SPD. These policies and guidance, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development demonstrates a high quality design that respects and responds positively to existing buildings and the local character and distinctiveness of the area. In addition, the proposal would not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework that developments should seek to secure a high quality of design (paragraph 124) that are sympathetic to the local character (paragraph 127).

Other Matters

14. I have considered the various benefits put forward by the appellant that the proposal would bring, including the scheme's high quality design and to create additional accommodation to meet the needs of the appellant's family. While I have given them some weight, these benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified. For all these reasons, there are no other material considerations to outweigh the development plan conflicts identified.

Conclusion

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

David Troy

INSPECTOR