

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4th January 2017

by Alison Roland BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/16/3163597
75 Turner Road, Edgware, HA8 6AT.

- 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 Mrs S Cheema against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref: P/3448/16, dated 18 July 2016 was refused by notice dated 12 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is first floor side and single storey rear extensions and conversion of existing rear first floor flat roof into pitched tile roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the implications of the proposal for the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is semi detached and has been extended in the past to both the side and rear, most notably from the public domain through the addition of a two storey extension to the side.
 4. The proposed extensions would result in only a small increase in the footprint of the existing dwelling, with the majority built above or in lieu of existing extensions. Notwithstanding this, their scale and bulk would amount to significant additions to the property in their own right, particularly at first floor level. The side extension would accentuate the linear proportions of the property compared to its attached neighbour and in conjunction with the existing side extension, would compound the marked asymmetry which presently exists between them. The original property would appear engulfed with extensions and the resultant dwelling would appear disproportionately wide and quite discordant compared with both its attached neighbour and the other houses in the street.
 5. I appreciate the appellant's point that many nearby properties have been extended in recent years, but none of the examples cited would to my mind be directly comparable in terms of their scale and proportions to the proposal
-

before me. I accept that the adjacent service road to one side would avoid any terracing effect, but this would not overcome my concerns about the scale and bulk of extensions proposed. The appellant says that planning permission was granted for an identical extension under the terms of application Ref: P/643/04/DFU in 2004. However, that permission was not implemented and there is no evidence to suggest it is capable of implementation. It was also issued prior to the adoption of the Development Plan policies cited below. I thus afford it limited weight as a material consideration.

6. On the main issue, I thus conclude that the proposed extensions would fail to harmonise both with the original dwelling and houses in the wider street, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would thus conflict with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework, as well as Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of the London Plan (2016), Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) and the advice in the Supplementary Planning Document: *Residential Design Guide* (2010). These promote high quality design in new development which responds positively to the public realm, is not detrimental to local character and appearance and ensures that extensions respect their host building and harmonise with its scale.
7. The Council also state that the proposal would appear obtrusive and harm the visual amenities of the neighbouring properties Nos 73 and 77. Having regard to the separation between the extensions and those properties, that is not a concern I share. Nonetheless, this does not outweigh my concerns on the main issue.

ALISON ROLAND

INSPECTOR