



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2020 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

**Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 13 August 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3243523**

**4 Tregenna Avenue, Harrow HA2 8QT**

- 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 T. Patel against the decision of the London Borough of Harrow Council.
  - The application Ref P/4102/19, dated 23 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2019.
  - The development proposed is a single storey side extension with conversion of existing utility into disabled bedroom.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located on the southern side of Tregenna Avenue. The house benefits from an existing two-storey side extension which features a utility room with garage style door. It lies within an established residential area characterised by blocks of terraced properties and pairs of semi-detached properties, with single storey side extensions, all of which are similarly sized which lends a degree of consistency to the street scene.
  5. The proposal would result in the erection of a single storey extension up to the common boundary with 2 Tregenna Avenue and the conversion of the existing ground floor utility room. The proposed plans show the existing garage door would be replaced by bedroom windows.
  6. Notwithstanding the use of matching materials, the subservient nature, sympathetic roof form and single-storey height of the proposed development; the dwelling would subsequently appear disproportionately large due to the excessive width and overall scale of the front elevation resulting from the proposal when seen with the existing two-storey side extension. This would
-

have a detrimental impact on the form and appearance of the property and would thus constitute poor design.

7. The resulting dwelling would appear awkward, dominant and would constitute an architecturally discordant feature in the area. I acknowledge there are several properties in the area that benefit from side extensions, however, these are more modestly sized or are not added on to previous extensions. In this case the extension would project out from an already extended double-storey flank elevation and so, due to the ensuing excessive width of the dwelling and its prominence in the street scene, the development would be visually obtrusive and uncharacteristic of the area. As such it would harm the appearance and characteristic consistency of the street scene.
8. I therefore find the proposal would not be compatible with the existing dwelling and would result in a visually discordant feature that would harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposed development would conflict with policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy, policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan, Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan as well as the National Planning Policy Framework which together seek to ensure proposals are well designed, compliment the character of the host building and the appearance of the locality. I have also had regard to the 'Residential Design Guide' Supplementary Planning Document which generally seeks the same.

### **Other Matters**

9. I acknowledge the appellant's personal family needs with regards to the creation of a downstairs bedroom. Although I sympathise with these personal circumstances, I consider that the permanent harm to the character and appearance of the area through the erection of the proposed extension outweighs the private benefits to the appellant.

### **Recommendation**

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Thomas Courtney*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

*Andrew Owen*

INSPECTOR