

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2021

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/20/3260470

49 Nibthwaite Road, Harrow, HA1 1TD

- 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 Alexandre Michael Levy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/2241/20, dated 2 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is a retrospective application for single part side to part rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The development the subject of this appeal has already taken place and is referred to below as "the development."

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an extended two storey semi-detached dwelling located on the corner of Nibthwaite Road and Colton Road within a residential area.
 5. The surrounding area is characterised by the presence of two storey semi-detached and occasional detached dwellings, largely dating from a similar period and set back from the road behind short parking areas and with gardens to the rear. Gaps between dwellings provide the area with a sense of spaciousness.
 6. During my site visit, I observed that many houses in the area have been altered and/or extended and that the majority of such changes appear in keeping with the host property and the character of the area.
 7. The appeal property is located in a prominent corner position. During my site visit, I observed that houses located adjacent to junctions along Nibthwaite Road tend not to be built up to the pavement edge but provide for a gap
-

between side elevations and the pavement. This adds to the area's sense of spaciousness.

8. The development the subject of this appeal extends the appeal property to the side and rear at ground floor level. This is in addition to a previous two storey side extension.
9. As such, the development protrudes beyond the previous side extension. It does so in a way which creates an irregular building line, such that the development appears as an unbalanced and somewhat bulky addition to the dwelling.
10. Furthermore, the development's mono-pitched roof fails to blend coherently with the host property, but instead, introduces a disharmonious feature which results in the development appearing as an awkward and incongruous addition.
11. Also, by projecting to the side, the development combines with the previous extension to result in the house being so wide as to appear disproportionate and unbalanced. The development also narrows the gap between the appeal property and the pavement at a prominent corner location.
12. The harmful impact of all of the above is exacerbated as a result of the appeal property's prominent location. The appeal property is widely visible in its surroundings and the incongruous features described draw attention to themselves.
13. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the development harms the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the Framework, to London Plan (2016) Policy 7.4B, to Core Strategy¹ Policy CS1.B, to DMP² Policy DM1, and to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

¹ Reference: Harrow Core Strategy (2012).

² Reference: Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).