

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/20/3261614

1 Woodberry Avenue, North Harrow, HA2 6AU

- 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 Tom Mohan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/2360/20, dated 13 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The development the subject of this appeal has already commenced 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 a two storey detached dwelling. It has been extended with a gable end and has a dormer and rooms at roof level. It is located within a residential area and is situated in a prominent position along Woodberry Avenue, close to its junction with Kingsfield Avenue.
 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/or gardens and with longer gardens to the rear.
 6. The setting back of housing from the street combines with gaps between dwellings and pairs of dwellings, and the presence of occasional grass verges and street trees, to provide the area with a sense of spaciousness and greenery. Further, whilst I noted during my site visit that many houses in the area have been altered and/or extended, the majority of such changes appear in keeping with host properties and the overall character of the area.
-

7. Further to the above, I also observed during my site visit that the regular presence of two storey bay windows and gable features, affords the area a modest sense of uniformity.
8. The Council points out that its Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010) states that, where a property has already been extended by the conversion of a hipped to gabled roof, a further side extension (first floor or two storey) is inappropriate.
9. The development extends out from the previously extended gable end at first floor level. I find that this results in the development appearing as an overly bulky feature which fails to appear subordinate to the host property. In addition, the development results in the property appearing dominant and boxy, and out of keeping with neighbouring dwellings.
10. The harm arising from this is exacerbated as a result of a combination of the prominent position of the appeal property - whereby the development appears widely visible in its surroundings – and the development’s dominant and obtrusive form.
11. Given this, I find that the development harms the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the Framework, to London Plan (2016) Policies 7.4B and 7.6B, 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

12. 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).