



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2022

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27TH June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3297539

38 Waverley Road, Harrow HA2 9RD

- 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 Milan Vadera against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/4783/21, dated 5 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single and two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. On his appeal form the appellant cites the Council's planning reference number as 'P/4783/21 and previously P/2120/21'. In his grounds of appeal ('GoA'), he refers to the merits of both those schemes.
3. However, at the time this appeal was submitted the deadline for lodging an appeal against application Ref P/2120/21 had expired. Additionally, in the introductory paragraph of his GoA he states that he is appealing against application Ref P/4783/21. It is that scheme that the Council referred to in its appeal notification letters, and I have also proceeded on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

5. The Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2010 ('SPD') sets out that extensions should harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building, and with the character of the area, and should not dominate the original building. At paragraph 6.64 it states that all roofs should be designed to reflect the character of the dwelling house and those adjoining, to provide a satisfactory appearance.
6. Paragraph 6.72 of the SPD that I have been provided with (and which is referred to as paragraph 6.71 by the appellant and in the officer report) relates to rear dormers and two storey side extensions. It is therefore of no relevance to this scheme.

7. No 38 Waverley Road is the end property in a short two storey terrace. To the front it has original sloping roofs, and it retains a prominent bay window and other architectural features typical of its era. To the rear however, and in common with many nearby properties, it has been significantly altered with a ground floor extension and a large dormer covering most of the roofslope.
8. As a result of this scheme, the ground floor extension would project a total of 6 metres from the host's original rear face. The Council has raised no objection to that element of this proposal, and given that there are similar nearby extensions on this side of Waverley Road, neither do I. In any event the Council has determined under application Ref: P/1202/21/PRIOR that prior approval is not required for such a scheme.
9. The proposed first floor section of the scheme would be 3 metres deep and would cover over half of the host's rear face. Consequently, it would have a significant bulk and mass. Its visual impact in this location high up on the building's rear face would be prominent from nearby gardens where, in the context of the host's existing hip to gable extension and dormer, and the existing and proposed ground floor projections, very little of the property's original form and style would remain.
10. Additionally, whilst the proposed flat roof at first floor would reflect the form of the dormer and the proposed ground floor extension, at this height it would be much more prominent than them. It's rather crude and rectilinear form would not represent good design.
11. I observed no other nearby properties on this side of Waverley Road with a first floor rear extension. For the above reasons, and notwithstanding the proposed use of matching materials, this one, when considered cumulatively alongside the other existing and proposed alterations, would subsume the original property, fail to respect its character, and give it a cluttered appearance.
12. At appendices 3 to 10 of his GoA the appellant has cited examples of various roof forms in the wider area. However, I have few details of those developments, including all their respective planning history, or the planning policies and guidance in place at the time. Some do not represent good design, and some relate to properties of a markedly different appearance compared to this one.
13. Looking at some of the nearby examples, the first floor rear extension at 363 Torbay Road appears to be significantly narrower than this one, and that property does not have a rear dormer. Compared to this scheme, the first floor rear projection at 110 Waverley Road is of a much more limited depth, has tapered sides, significantly less mass, and greater architectural merit.
14. None of those examples alter my conclusions regarding the harm that this scheme would cause to this building.
15. Amongst other things, and in general terms, Policy D3 of The London Plan 2021, Policy CS1 Part B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies 2013, require proposals to be of a high design standard, and to respect the host building. The National Planning Policy Framework also sets out the fundamental importance of good design as a key aspect of sustainable development.

16. No objections to the scheme were raised by any neighbours, and I note the appellant's dissatisfaction with the Council's handling of his applications.
17. However, having considered the proposal on its merits, for the above reasons, I find that it would not harmonise with the style of the original building. Having regard to cumulative impacts, it would harm the host's character and appearance, and it would thus conflict with the above policies, and with the advice in the SPD.
18. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR