



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 May 2022

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3293571

91 Weston Drive, Stanmore, London, HA7 2EW

- 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 Shyr Gami against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/4673/21, dated 19 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a window and door to the front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the window and door on the character and appearance of the host property and the immediate locality along Weston Drive.

Reasons

3. No 91 is a detached house situated on the western side of Weston Drive. In common with many other houses along this part of the road it has a single-storey side extension, in this case, on its southern side. The front door is located at the northern end of the front elevation and is within a curved corner element. This curved feature including front door is one of a small number of characteristic architectural designs that typifies this part of Weston Road. The adjacent No 93 also exhibits this feature. The development proposed has already been carried out and consists of a door and window inserted into the front elevation of the single-storey side extension.
4. Policy CS1 of the Council's Core Strategy (CS) indicates that new development should protect the character of Harrow's suburbs. Policy DM1 of the Council's Development Management Policies document (DMP) indicates that all development must achieve a high standard of design and layout. The assessment of this should have regard, amongst other things, to the appearance of proposed buildings, including detailing, and the context provided by neighbouring buildings and the local character.
5. The Harrow Residential Design Guide (SPD) includes guidance for Householder Development. This indicates that developments should harmonise with the architectural style of the original dwellinghouse and the character of the area.

6. The Council contends that the second entrance door, by reason of its appearance and design, would fail to respect the prevailing character and rhythm of entrance doors within the street scene, and would create two main entrances to the subject property.
7. The appellant contends that the door and window replace a window that was formerly in the same position and that there is no radical difference between the replacement door and window and the window that was formerly in place. Moreover, the development is modest in size, scale, prominence and visual impact. In addition, the appellant contends that the houses next door at Nos 87 and 89 have similar secondary doors in their front elevations.
8. This part of Weston Drive is characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached houses of similar scale and with a small number of similar basic designs. None would appear to have secondary front doors. The door in the front elevation at No 91 has the appearance of a second front door at the opposite end of the front elevation from the original front door. Moreover, it also includes a letter box and it has an incongruous 'glazed' canopy above it. It appears unsympathetic and inappropriate in the context of the host property and the immediate locality.
9. Nos 87, 89 and 93 all have side garages/extensions with doors that have the appearance in the street scene of garage doors. Nos 87 and 89 have clearly identifiable single front doors with a porch. No 93, which is of the same architectural design as the appeal property, retains its single front door in the curved north-eastern corner of the house, as do other houses in the vicinity that have the same design feature. On this basis, the second door in the front elevation of the appeal property appears significantly and harmfully out of character with its surroundings. Furthermore, it does not harmonise with the architectural detailing of the original dwelling house.
10. The appellant contends that the second door is necessary because, for religious reasons, the family maintains two kitchens and the new door provides access to the second kitchen without going through the formal reception rooms in the house. However, though I sympathise with the appellant's requirements, I consider that this arrangement is not the only way of dealing with the issue, and that these personal requirements do not outweigh the harm done to the character or appearance of the house and its surroundings by having an additional inappropriate and visually unsympathetic second front door.
11. The appellant also suggests that the proposed development may have permitted development rights. I have dealt with this case as an appeal against refusal of planning permission subsequent to submission of a planning application. It is, of course, open to the appellant to clarify the position by way of submitting an application for a Certificate of Lawful Development.
12. In conclusion, I find that the proposed front door and window arrangement is harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the immediate locality along Weston Drive. On this basis, it conflicts with Policy CS1 of the CS, Policy DM1 of the DMP, and guidance on Household Extensions given in the SPD. Accordingly, I dismiss this appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR