



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2023

by Stewart Glassar BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/23/3317624

12 Newbolt Road, Harrow, Stanmore HA7 3LT

- 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 F Vascu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/2807/22, dated 28 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of dwelling into two flats (2 x 2 bed); Single and two storey side extension; Single storey rear extension; External alterations; Parking; Separate amenity space; bin and cycle stores.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the building and wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises an existing semi-detached dwelling. Properties in the vicinity are either semi-detached or form part of small terraces. There is some variation in the house designs and some houses have been subject to alteration and extension. Nevertheless, there is an element of homogeneity which is reinforced by the regular size, height and positioning of the houses. The predominant finish is brick with brown roof tiles. Houses in the area are generally set back from their site frontages and together with the generous grass verges that separate vehicles from the footpaths, the area has a suburban and spacious character.
4. The appeal property itself has had an extension to the rear, a hip-to-gable roof extension and a box dormer that sits above the eaves and below the ridge of the roof and covers much of the rear roof slope. Whilst visible from the road, these works are not overly prominent.
5. The Council raises no objection to the single storey side and rear extensions; external alterations; parking; separate amenity space; bin or cycle stores. I have no reason to conclude differently from the Council. I have therefore primarily focussed my decision on the two-storey side extension.
6. The two-storey element of the proposal would have a hipped roof to the side of the existing gable elevation. The north-eastern corner of this roof would have a chamfered edge to accommodate the angled boundary line with No. 10 Newbolt Road. This addition, combined with the existing gable and visible flat roof of the

existing dormer, would create a bulky and somewhat contrived roof design. The resulting form and complexity would be far more prominent than the current situation and it would appear unsympathetic both to the appearance of the host property and the wider street scene.

7. The dwelling attached to the appeal property is No. 2 Sitwell Grove. It is evident that the alterations to No. 2 somewhat undermine the simplicity of its original appearance and the balance it no doubt once had with the appeal property. These works have added bulk and changed the roof form which to an extent detract from the street scene. The hip-to-gable extension at the appeal property has further undermined the balance between the two houses. Whilst the proposal would re-introduce a hipped roof to the side of the appeal property, the overall result would clearly be different from that at No.2. Any degree of symmetry or balance that might result between the houses would not lessen or overcome the harms I have identified above.
8. As I have noted, other properties in the vicinity have been subject to extension and alteration. I observed on my site visit that other than for No. 2, extensions generally appear to assimilate acceptably in terms of their design and do not, based on what I have seen, harm the character and appearance of the street scene in the same way the appeal proposals would. They do not therefore lead me to allowing the appeal.
9. I therefore find that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the building and wider area. It is therefore contrary to Policies D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012 and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013 which, amongst other things, seek to ensure developments have regard to the context provided by neighbouring buildings and the local character and that they achieve a high standard of design, including in their roof form.
10. The reason for refusal refers to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Design Guide' 2010. The paragraphs referenced in the Officer Report relate to householder development which, technically, does not encompass the proposal. Nevertheless, the broad aim of the document is to help achieve a high standard of design and layout in residential development and I have found that the proposal would not achieve this aim.

Other Matters

11. The Council referenced several appeal decisions, to which the appellant provided opposing commentary. Whilst these provide interesting background, I have considered the appeal proposal on its individual merits and with regard to the specific circumstances of the site and its surrounds.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the building and wider area and would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Stewart Glassar
INSPECTOR