

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2022

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3303177

12 Kelvin Crescent, Harrow, HA3 6DP

- 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 Oladeji Abdul Akeem Kuku against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/0530/22, dated 21 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension over garage and alterations to porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development is taken from the application form. The Council's decision notice describes the proposed development as "Single storey front infill extension. First floor side extension."

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an extended two storey detached dwelling with a single storey, flat-roofed attached garage to the side. The dwelling is located towards the end of a cul-de-sac and is set back from the road behind a small parking area and has a garden to the rear.
 5. The surrounding area is residential and is characterised by the presence of two storey detached dwellings set back from the road behind short front gardens and/or parking areas and with longer gardens to the rear.
 6. Whilst dwellings are located relatively close to one another, the front gardens and/or parking areas combine with the presence of gaps between dwellings, including above single storey elements, to provide for a sense of spaciousness.
 7. During my site visit I noted that, whilst many dwellings in the area have been altered and/or extended, such changes tend to appear in keeping with and subservient to the host property and in keeping with the surrounding area.
-

8. The proposed development would include a first floor extension to the side of the appeal property. I find that when combined with the existing first floor extension to the other side of the dwelling, the proposal would result in additions of such scale and volume as to overwhelm and subsume the original appearance of the host dwelling.
9. Rather than appear subservient, the proposed extension would, due to its height, scale and minimal set back from the front elevation, add considerable bulk to the appeal property. I find that it would result in the creation of an overly-wide dwelling that would unduly dominate its plot and appear out of keeping with neighbouring dwellings that do not appear unduly dominant in their surroundings.
10. The harm arising from the above would be exacerbated by the prominent first floor siting of the proposal such that it would draw attention to itself as a visually obtrusive and incongruous addition.
11. Further to the above, the proposed extension would fill a gap between the appeal property and its neighbour, Number 10 Kelvin Crescent. This would reduce the identified spacious qualities of the area and in so doing, it would emphasise the prominence and undue dominance of the proposed development within the wider street scene.
12. Taking the above into account, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to London Plan (2021) Policy D3; to Core Strategy¹ Policy CS1; 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

13. 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).