

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2021

by K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3270935

12 Wilsmere Drive, Harrow Weald, Middlesex, HA3 6BJ

- 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 M Jaffer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/4535/20, dated 10 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is the removal of garage and rear conservatory and erection of a single storey side extension.
-

Application for Costs

1. An application for costs was made by Mr M Jaffer against the Council of the London Borough of Harrow. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed single storey side extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Wilsmere Drive.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a traditional detached house on a wide plot with a detached single storey garage separated from the dwelling by a noticeable gap infilled by a wall. It is located in a cul-de-sac of architecturally similar dwellings, which are mostly semi-detached, and two more recent chalet bungalows which have been designed in a traditional style with prominent hipped, pitched roofs. One of the bungalows which lies adjacent to the appeal dwelling is set on a noticeably wide plot. At the end of the cul-de-sac is a large care home of traditional design with a newer wing facing Wilsmere Drive.
 5. The proposed development comprises the demolition of the garage and a rear conservatory and the erection of a single storey side extension. This would be some 7m wide and would occupy the gap and the site of the garage plus about
-

1m beyond the footprint of the garage. It would have a depth of some 8.8m which equates to the full depth of the dwelling. The extension would have a false dual pitched roof of some 3.6m in height with a flat roof some 3m in height behind.

6. The extension would be more than the width of the original dwelling and its lack of height and small, false roof would exacerbate the incongruity of its excessive and disproportionate width. The proposed windows, although similar to windows in the host dwelling, would have a horizontal emphasis which would draw further attention to the poor proportions of the extension. The false roof and extensive area of flat roof behind would be clearly visible in the street scene and would be out of keeping with other dwellings where flat roofs are mostly associated with modest garages. Overall, the extension would be a prominent and jarring presence in the street scene, appearing as a bulky and unsympathetic addition, detracting from the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
7. The appellant suggests that the proposed extension would be acceptable because it, in part, occupies the site of the garage, would not mask the frontage of the dwelling, would respect the building line in the street and leaves a gap to the site boundary. However, these matters would not alter or overcome the shortcomings in the scale and design of the extension. The appellant also refers to a small single storey extension on the opposite side of the host dwelling which is a similar height to the proposed extension. However, this is a narrow addition and therefore its height is in proportion with its width.
8. It is concluded on the main issue that the proposed extension would fail to harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the host dwelling and would therefore be materially harmful to its character and appearance and that of the street scene of Wilsmere Drive. In consequence, it would conflict with Core Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy, 2012, Policy DM1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies, 2013, Policies D1 and D3 of the recently adopted London Plan, 2021, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Design Guide, 2010. Taken together these policies and guidance expect new development, including extensions, to enhance local character by exhibiting a high standard of design such that it responds positively to the local and historic context, reinforces the positive attributes of local distinctiveness and respects the host building.
9. The appellant suggests that the principle of a residential extension should be acceptable due to the residential character of the street and its accessibility to shops, services and public transport. That may be so. However, this would not exempt an extension from needing to comply with local and national policies and guidance in terms of its siting, scale and design.
10. The appellant also draws my attention to the bungalow adjacent to the appeal dwelling and suggests that the proposed extension would be comparable with the single storey wing on that dwelling. However, this is an architecturally integral and sympathetic element of the overall design of the dwelling and is not readily comparable with the appeal proposal.

11. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, including that the appeal dwelling is not listed or in a conservation area, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR