



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2020

by Martin Chandler BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/20/3254170

9 London Road, Stanmore HA7 4PA

- 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 Sameer Shah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/0899/20, dated 9 March 2020, was refused by notice 12 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is part hip to gable loft extension with rear dormer and internal alterations to first floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a large detached dwelling with a hipped roof and due to its width and overall size, it occupies a commanding presence in the street. The house is set back from, but angled towards the road in a manner that is consistent with the neighbouring dwellings. The neighbouring houses exhibit differing façade treatments, and therefore the street scene is not uniform in its appearance. However, the roof form of the appeal site is consistent with the other properties within the street which overwhelmingly have hipped roofs. The combination of the roof forms and the angled siting of the dwellings establish a clear and distinct rhythm within the street scene which positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The proposal would alter the roof form of the building by increasing the eaves height to the side elevations. This would elongate the ridge of the roof and increase the height of the side facing roofslopes. As a consequence, the proposal would substantially increase the visual bulk of the roof. Due to the overall size of the existing building, the enlarged bulk and mass would significantly increase its presence within the street, creating a visually dominant building that would be distinctly at odds with the prevailing street scene. The increased bulk of the building would therefore be harmful to the established rhythm found within the street.

5. My attention has been drawn to two examples of a similar roof form elsewhere in the road. However, these are somewhat removed from the appeal site and are therefore not experienced in its immediate context. In addition, these examples are on narrower houses and as a consequence, the increased bulk at roof level is less perceptible. These examples do not therefore alter my findings set out above.
6. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore fail to comply with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), Policies D1 and D3 of the London Plan – Intend to Publish version (2019), Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) and guidance within the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2010). Taken together, these seek amongst other things, high standards of development.

Other Matters

7. I note that the proposal would provide accommodation for elderly parents who require assistance with care. The social benefits that this would bring adds some weight in favour of the appeal but does not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.

Conclusion

8. The appeal should be dismissed.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR