



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2019

by Rachael Pipkin, BA (Hons), MPhil, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3231802

1 Cheyneys Avenue, Edgware, HA8 6SA

- 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 & Mrs Ogundipe against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref: P/1928/19 dated 23 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey front & rear, two storey side extension also alteration to roof to form end gable (following demolishing of conservatory and side extension).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of my site visit, I observed that building works were underway. I noted that the rear single-storey extension under construction did not appear to fully accord with the submitted drawings. However, I have determined this appeal on the basis of the submitted drawings.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at 3 Cheyneys Avenue, with regard to outlook and sunlight.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Number 1 Cheyneys Avenue (No. 1) is a two-storey semi-detached house which occupies a prominent position due to it being the first house on the street. The surrounding area is residential, laid out in a regular pattern of development characterised by pairs of similar semi-detached properties with hipped roofs. Whilst a few properties have been extended at roof level to create a gable end, the area remains quite uniform in appearance.

5. The proposed development would extend the hipped roof to create a gable end. An existing single-storey side extension would be demolished and replaced with a two-storey side extension with a gabled roof which would be set back from the front roof slope. A narrow single-storey front extension would be added and to the rear, an existing conservatory would be removed and replaced with a single-storey extension.
6. The two-storey side extension in combination with the gabled roof and alterations to the main roof would be a significant addition to this modestly sized house. Whilst the side extension has been set back from the main front elevation at first floor level, the roof design would be unsympathetic to the design of the original house. The shape of the proposed roof would make the extension appear bulky and overly large. This would harm the character and appearance of the house.
7. The size and bulk of the side extension would unbalance the pair of semi-detached houses, making No. 1 appear much larger than 3 Cheyneys Avenue (No. 3). This would harm the symmetry of this pair of houses and the regular pattern of development characteristic of the street.
8. Since a number of houses along Cheyneys Avenue have been extended at roof level to create a gable end, a similar extension to the main roof of the appeal property would not appear incongruous. However, whilst there are examples of two-storey side extensions, including to 9 Cheyneys Avenue which the appellant has referred me to, these are a different design, incorporating hipped roofs which are sympathetic to the character and appearance of the host property. They are not as large or as prominent as the appeal proposal and, therefore are not directly comparable.
9. Consequently, the two-storey extension in combination with the roof alteration would not be in keeping with the pattern and form of development within the wider area. It would result in a much larger and bulkier form of development compared to surrounding properties. Furthermore, due to the position of No. 1, as an end house site with a flank wall visible from the street, it would be widely visible and appear more prominent.
10. The front extension would be modest in size and similar to other extensions along the street and therefore in keeping with the wider area. The rear extensions would not be widely visible from the public realm and would therefore have little impact on the character and appearance of the wider area.
11. I conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy CS1B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012 (the Core Strategy) and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies 2013 (DMP) and Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of the London Plan 2016¹ which together and amongst other things, seek high quality design that enhances the public realm and respects local character. It would also not accord with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). It would also not conform with the design advice set out in the Harrow Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (the SPD) which sets out, amongst other things, that extensions should harmonise with

¹ The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011

the scale and architectural style of the original building and the character of the area.

Living conditions

12. The proposed single-storey rear extension would project rearwards along the boundary with No. 3 positioned directly south of No. 1. It would occupy the same footprint as the existing conservatory and would have a part flat/part pitched roof.
13. No 3 has a bay window in the rear elevation which appears to serve a living room which would be considered a 'protected window' in the SPD. The flank wall of the proposed extension would be on the boundary adjacent to this window and would project rearwards as far as the existing conservatory. However, it would be significantly higher and a more solid brick construction than the conservatory which would project above the existing timber fence. The pitched roof design would help to reduce the overall height; however, it would nevertheless be a taller and bulkier building along this boundary than the existing conservatory. This would lead to a greater sense of enclosure and would significantly reduce outlook from this rear window.
14. The single-storey extension, due to its height, length and position to the south of the adjacent window, would be likely to lead to some overshadowing. In the absence of any technical evidence to show that there would not be an unacceptable loss of sunlight, I am not persuaded that the proposed single-storey extension would not harm the living conditions of the occupants of No. 3 through overshadowing.
15. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at 3 Cheyneys Avenue, with regard to outlook and sunlight. It would therefore conflict with Policy 7.6B of the London Plan and Policy DM1 of the DMP. It would also not comply with the Residential Design Guide SPD and the Framework. These policies and guidance together seek to protect the living conditions of neighbouring properties from inappropriate development.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachael Pipkin

Inspector