



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 March 2023

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/23/3315547

27 Elms Road, Harrow Weald, London, HA3 6BB

- 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 Ceejay Shah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3672/22, dated 24 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey side garage extension; two storey front extension; first floor front extension with gable; first floor rear extension; alterations and extension to roof; rear dormer; rooflights in front, both side roofslopes and crown; external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. In the interests of clarity, in the banner heading above I have referred to the description of the proposal given by the appellant on the appeal form as this gives a clear description of the type of development proposed which reflects that used by the Council in their decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached house which has been substantially altered to the side and rear such that the original form of the building is difficult to discern. Nonetheless, from the street the dominant features are two, 2 storey, projecting bays with hipped roofs. The larger bay sits over a double garage and has a higher roof ridge but mirrors the design of the smaller bay in terms of its roof and window design and the hanging tiles between the ground and first floor. This provides an element of symmetry to the building. A lower 2 storey flat roofed section above a porticoed central porch connects the 2 bays, breaking up the roof mass between them, and in so doing drawing attention to them. Other elements of the building sit back from each other, providing a staggered building line that breaks up the front façade and provides an element of subordination.

5. The proposed front extensions would infill part of the recessed elements. The roof would be raised to the level of the prominent 2 storey bay, thus removing the flat roofed elements which currently break up the roof mass and replacing the lower bay hipped roof, which contributes to the symmetry of the building, with a crown roof. The proposed front pitched roof gable would be an incongruous addition with a roof pitch and design at odds with the rest of the building. Overall, the elements of symmetry and subordination that characterise the existing house would be lost and replaced with a top heavy and dominant roof which would harm the property's appearance.
6. The proposed side garage would extend close to the boundary with the neighbouring house. Whereas other elements of the house are staggered, the garage would be in line with the large 2 storey bay. A gap would be retained between the host property and the neighbouring house, thus preventing a terracing effect. Nonetheless, in combination with other existing extensions it would widen the frontage to a degree that, despite its single storey, would over elongate the frontage and appear excessive. Overall, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and wider street scene contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), Core policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies (2013) and the Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guide (2010) which require development to be of a high standard of design and that extensions should respect and not dominate the original building or surrounding street.

Other Matters

7. Procedural issues relating to pre-application advice and the Council's policy on site visits remain a matter between the main parties. More particularly, my remit is limited to assessing the planning merits and impacts of the proposed development, and I have reached my decision on this basis.
8. I have had regard to the planning appeal decision referred to in the appellant's statement. Whilst I note that the building allowed by the appeal is substantial and includes a crown roof, that development comprises flats rather than extensions to an existing house. As such it is not directly comparable to the scheme before me, and I accord it limited weight.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR