
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 July 2016

By Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 04 August 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/16/3147563
8 Northwick Avenue, Harrow HA3 0AB

- 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 Balaji Srinivasan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref: 15/5623 dated 15 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 7 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is part side/front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached property on the south side of Northwick Avenue, within a predominantly residential area and close to the junction with Kenton Road. Most of the properties are semi-detached properties with a small number of detached properties. Although a number of the properties have been extended and altered, the prominence of the front bay at ground and first floor on many of the properties remains a characteristic feature in the street scene. The dwelling, as existing, has a front porch which projects forward in line with the front bay and a side extension which is set back.
4. The proposal would bring the side extension forward and create a front and side extension which would wrap around the corner of the property under a low pitched roof. I consider that this bulky addition would appear as an incongruous extension to the property. Its width, forward projection and proposed roof form would detract from the existing proportions of the property and compete with the visual prominence of the main bay feature.
5. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the street scene. This would conflict with Policies BE2, BE7 and BE9 of the Council's adopted Unitary Development Plan 2004 and guidance in the Supplementary Planning Guidance 5: *Altering and Extending Your Home*, all of which seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.

6. The Appellant has drawn my attention to a small number of other properties in the street which already have a similar extension to the one proposed at the appeal dwelling. The Council has conducted a similar exercise and I also undertook an analysis of the various extensions and alterations in the vicinity of the appeal property. Whilst I agree that there are a small number of similar extensions in the street, I do not regard them as being prevalent or sufficient to have become part of the pattern of development which is characteristic of the local area. I have taken the small number of similar extensions into account but they do not persuade me that more should be permitted given the harm I have concluded.
7. I agree with the Appellant that the proposal would not have a harmful impact on light to the adjoining property. This was also not raised by the Council as a reason for refusal and my consideration has primarily focussed on the effect of the proposal on the street scene.
8. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR