



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020

by M Heron BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/20/3244342

3 Kenmore Gardens, Edgware HA8 5HE

- 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 Ms Afsana Bhuiya against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3977/19, dated 13 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupants of No 2 Kenmore Gardens, with particular regard to outlook and access to daylight.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. No 3 is a two storey, semi-detached, property positioned within a cul-de-sac of dwellings in a residential area. In common with the adjoining property, No 2, it has a hipped main roof and a front facing gable feature. These properties also have similar two storey outriggers to the rear constructed under a shared pitched roof. Such architectural features give Nos 2 and 3 a sense of balance. No 3 also has a single storey side/rear element which is set back from the principal elevation and adjoins the outrigger. This is constructed under a flat roof behind a small dummy pitch roof. The scale of this feature ensures that it does not disrupt the balance between Nos 2 and 3.
4. This proposal seeks permission to construct a first floor extension to the above mentioned single storey side/rear element at No 3. This would not harm a historic environment and suitable materials could be used for its external surfaces. Nevertheless, the proposed extension would be significant in depth and its flat roof would appear to be constructed marginally above the main eaves level of No 3. Overall, it would add a considerable amount of bulk and mass to the side and rear of the host property, which would reduce the overall

- width of its outrigger. Not only would this extension therefore appear as an unduly large and bulky addition to No 3, but it would also disrupt the balance it shares with No 2. The proposal's excessive bulk and mass would be exacerbated by the large expanse of unbroken render within its southern flank elevation.
5. Furthermore, in my view the extension's large flat roof would create a visually jarring transition between hipped and pitched roof forms at No 3. This would reinforce its incongruity. Taking this, and all of the above into account, I find that the proposal would fail to integrate effectively with the design of the host property and would disrupt the harmony of surrounding built form. Although the scheme would not be conspicuous when viewed from The Highlands, its harmful impact would be apparent from certain vantage points along Kenmore Gardens and from the rear of several nearby properties.
 6. My attention has been drawn to a similar development at No 14 Kenmore Gardens. I appreciate that this development is closer to the front elevation of the host property than the proposal would be. However, it would appear that it was granted prior to the adoption of the Council's current development plan. It is therefore not directly comparable to the appeal scheme, which I have assessed on its own individual planning merits in any event.
 7. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (LP), Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Document Policies (DMP). Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that developments are of the highest architectural quality, have regard to the form, function and structure of an area and resist schemes which would harm the character of suburban areas. It would also conflict with the Harrow Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which requires that extensions harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building as well as the character of the area. Furthermore, there would be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) insofar it seeks to ensure that developments add to the quality of areas.

Living Conditions

8. I acknowledge that the proposal would breach a 45 degree sight line taken from the nearest first floor rear corner of No 2. This would be contrary to the guidance within the SPD. However, it would be sufficiently set away from the shared boundary with this property. In addition, the proposal's flat roof, whilst harmful to the character and appearance of No 3, would reduce its perceived bulk and mass when viewed from the side. Consequently, I am not persuaded that the depth, scale and positioning of the extension would appear as a dominant or oppressive feature when viewed from within No 2 or its rear garden. Identified conflict with the guidance of the SPD would therefore not result in any material planning harm. Taking this into account, and with regard to the orientation of Nos 2 and 3 on their plots, I am also satisfied that the scheme would not unacceptably diminish the access to daylight at No 2.
9. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would not result in harm to the living conditions of the occupants of No 2 in terms of outlook and access to daylight. It would therefore accord with Policy 7.6 of the LP and Policy DM1 of

the DMP insofar as they seek to ensure that developments do not cause harm to the living conditions at surrounding buildings in terms of access to daylight and outlook. It would also accord with the Framework insofar as it seeks to provide a high standard of amenity for current users.

Other Matter

10. Any concerns regarding due process during the processing of the planning application fall outside of the remit of this decision.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations, including the advice of the Framework, which outweigh this conflict. This is so even in the absence of objections from neighbours. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Heron

INSPECTOR