
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2020

by Jan Hebblethwaite MA Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/20/3250661

26 Kenmore Road, Kenton, Harrow HA3 9EL

- 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 Rajan Shah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/0137/20 dated 10 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension incorporating front porch and bin storage, two storey side to rear and single storey rear extension (demolition of attached garage, canopy at rear and shed)
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the appearance of the host property and on the street scene.

Reasons

3. The host property is an end of terrace house in a wholly residential area, probably constructed during the 1930s or 1940s. It is located close to the prominent junction of Kenmore Road and Charlton Road and is one of a short stretch of houses with a similar original design on the western side of Kenmore Road, comprising terraces of four houses. The immediate area contains houses of different sizes and styles, of a similar age. The host property has previously been extended by the addition of a roof extension with the original hipped roof changed to a gable end.
4. The neighbouring house at No 24 (at the end of the next terrace) has been extended by a two-storey side extension, the upper floor of which is set back from the front of the house and has a hipped roof with ridge matching the slope and style of the original roof.
5. The proposed two-storey side extension would have a hipped roof matching the slope of the extension at No 24 but which would be truncated where it joined the existing gable end and would not have a ridge. The proposed extension would close the gap between the host property and No 24 and would create a flat roofed two-storey extension to the rear together with a single storey element.

6. The Council's Core Strategy¹ ("CS") and Development Management Policies² ("DM") provide guidance on design, including Policy CS1 which requires development to respond positively to the local context in terms of (amongst other things), design and spacing. Policy DM1 confirms that development must achieve a high standard of design and that assessment of proposals will have regard to massing, bulk, scale and height in relation to the location and surroundings. The appearance of the proposed development will also be assessed including (amongst other matters) roof form and the context of neighbouring buildings and pattern of development. The Council has also adopted a Residential Design Guide³ ("RDG") which advises that the roof form of a house is a significant part of the character of an area. The RDG also advises that side extensions should reflect the pattern of development in the street scene and that where a property has been extended by the conversion of a hipped roof to a gabled roof, any further extension is inappropriate.
7. Whilst the slope of the roof to the side extension would match the slope of that at No 24, the roof would appear contrived and awkward where it joins the gable end. The side extension would visually close the gap between No 24 and the host property, and in the light of the existing gable end wall and contrived roof slope, the overall appearance would be overbearing and incongruous in the street scene.
8. The two-storey rear extension would have a flat roof which has been reduced in width from previous proposals. However, the bulk of the extension itself and the extent of the flat roof is such that it would be cluttered, imposing and out of character with the host property. Taken together with the side extension, the overall development would be overbearing. For these reasons I conclude that the design of the proposed development would cause harm to the appearance of the host property and to the street scene. It would therefore be contrary to the policies in the CS and DM, and the guidance in the RDG.
9. I have taken into account the policies in the NPPF⁴ and the London Plan 2016 in relation to high quality design, which are reflected in the CS and DM.
10. I have looked at the other properties referred to by the Appellant. I do not consider them to be comparable to the host property, not least because of the previous extensions and changes to the roof at the host property.

Other considerations

11. The Appellant considers that the development will enable his family to have a more comfortable space. I accept that the NPPF has policies which aim to improve living standards, but I do not consider that the living standards of the host property are such that a need for improvement would outweigh the application of the development plan policies referred to in this decision letter.

¹ Harrow Core Strategy February 2012

² Harrow Council Development Management Policies July 2013

³ Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document 15 December 2010

⁴ National Planning Policy Framework

Planning Balance and Conclusion

12. The proposed development is contrary to the development plan in that it would be harmful to the appearance of the host property and to the street scene. The determination of the appeal should be in accordance with the development plan and I do not consider that there are any material considerations which indicate otherwise. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jan Hebblethwaite

INSPECTOR