



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 October 2021

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 October 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3278216

103 Twyford Road, Harrow, HA2 0SJ

- 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 P Kugapalan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/0971/21, dated 9 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and side double storey extension (demolish the existing garage).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appeal property benefits from prior approval for a single storey rear extension¹ and a certificate of lawful development² was granted for alterations to the roof to form an end gable, rear dormer, front rooflights and a window in the end gable.

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 semi-detached dwelling which, at the time of my site visit, was being extended. The property is located in a prominent position, adjacent to a mini-roundabout type feature and to a public right of way, along Twyford Road.
5. The surrounding area is residential and is characterised by the presence of two storey semi-detached dwellings, 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.

¹ Ref: P/1962/20/PRIOR.

² Ref: P/3049/19.

6. The gardens and setting back of housing from the street combine with gaps between dwellings and pairs of dwellings, and the presence of 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 with the overall character of the area.
7. 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.
8. The proposed development would result in a further two storey extension adjacent to an area already extended by the conversion of a hipped to a gable roof. This would result in the creation of an unduly bulky addition, that would, due to its scale and prominence, overwhelm and fail to appear subordinate to, , the host property.
9. 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. Further, the large and bulky built appearance of the proposal would detract from the area’s identified green and spacious attributes.
10. Given this, I find that the development harms the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the Framework; to London Plan (2021) Policy D3.D; to Core Strategy³ Policy CS1.B; to DMP⁴ 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

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

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

³ Reference: Harrow Core Strategy (2012).

⁴ Reference: Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).