



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2022

By A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3307006

33 High View PINNER HA5 3PE

- 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 and Mrs H & M Bakshi against the decision of The London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref: P/1762/22 dated 13 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is two-storey front extension, single storey side, single and two storey rear extension, relocation of front door and external alterations, installation of 3 no. front rooflights and 1 no. on the side elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue:

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and upon the surrounding area.

Reasons:

3. Number 33 High View (No.33) is a detached two storey house in an established and high quality residential area. Although the design and appearance of dwellings tends to vary from plot to plot, the character of the area rests upon the expansive and well-landscaped setting in which the houses are found. In this regard No.33 and its neighbour 31 High View appear, notwithstanding changes to No.31, as a symmetrical pair exhibiting strong Arts and Crafts influences in their original design. The relatively narrow, steep-sloping and simply articulated roof volumes, use of chimneys and timber clad upper storey together with judicious use of fenestration and careful attention to detailing are factors which underpin the strong architectural character of these dwellings which, thereby make a positive contribution to the street scene.
4. The appellant points to alterations to No.31 in support of the proposal; in particular the additional front gable and a two-storey extension. Nevertheless these changes have not unduly disrupted the positive aspects of that design whilst adding floor area. The use of well-detailed discreet roof dormers in the rear roof slope and the retention of the simple form of the main roof and absence of any obtrusive rooflights all demonstrate an appreciation of the design quality found in the original property and, moreover, the part played by roof form in Arts and Crafts influenced design.

5. Turning to what is proposed, the appellant seeks to enlarge a dwelling of moderate size arranged over 2 floors into something very much larger over three levels including a loft conversion. The increase in floor area would require removal of much of the existing fabric, tantamount to a rebuild, and significantly beyond what the Council's design guide addresses. Although the appellant comments that the changes from previous proposals which failed at appeal 'resolve(s) the inspector's core concern' it is the amount of additional accommodation sought to be provided which has, given the constraints within which the original high quality design evolved, presented a very significant challenge. A challenge which, to my mind, has not been met in what is before me.
6. Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Local Plan (2013) (DMLP) requires all development proposals to achieve a high standard of design and layout, which is supported by the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Design requiring extensions to 'harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original dwellinghouse'.
7. The proposed elevations reveal the extent of change envisaged; an increase in the main transverse roof depth spreads its slope to an unacceptable degree; the tiled cant roof edges stepping out from the rear elevation in combination with the large sigma profile dormer extension all appear as architectural devices entirely alien to the design principles I have identified. The location of these features above the ground storey means they would be prominently apparent. The insertion of additional fenestration to the front elevation, specifically the rooflights and the small window at the peak of the existing gable undermine these same principles, cluttering the simply-articulated roof forms which are fundamental to the dwelling's character.
8. Overall I consider that the extent and bulk of the proposed development would, cumulatively, subsume the original built form to an unacceptable degree and fail to harmonise with the existing building or its neighbour (No.31). What is proposed would harm both the character and appearance of the host dwelling and, thereby, of the area.
9. My attention is drawn to previous appeal decisions in this matter where the Inspector concludes, in summary, that the works proposed, although differing between the applications and what is now proposed, were not of a sufficient design quality for the appeals to be allowed. So whilst the appellant, entirely reasonably, points to the variety of architectural approaches and extensions to other properties, this does not justify harm to a building which has, by and large, retained its original design quality in terms of built form and appearance.
10. As my reasoning directs, I conclude that the proposal would directly conflict with Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM1 of the DMLP and with the relevant sections of the Council's Design Guide, thereby failing to accord with the development plan taken as a whole. Consequently, taking all matters raised into account, the appeal cannot succeed.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR