



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 8 June 2021

by Stewart Glassar BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3268007

43 Prescelly Place, Edgware HA8 6DH

- 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 Beni Beno against the decision of London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3266/20, dated 29 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and wider street scene.

Preliminary Matters

3. Between the determination of the planning application and the appeal coming before me, the new London Plan¹ has been adopted by the Mayor, with Policy D3 being relevant to this appeal. The views of the appellant have been sought on the up to date development plan situation and I have determined the appeal with regard to the adopted development plan at the time I make this decision.

Reasons

4. The area immediately around the appeal site is generally characterised by two storey semi-detached dwellings. Although there are differing styles and some properties have had extensions and alterations, including the appeal property, the overriding appearance is one of modest buildings with hipped roofs. Together with the set back positions of the houses, limited built form close to street corners and spacing between properties, there is a sense of homogeneity that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The appeal property occupies a corner plot. In addition to a hip-to-gable and dormer roof extension, the property has previously been extended at ground floor level, out to the side boundary with Tenby Road and across the rear of the property. However, the single storey extensions are not overly prominent within the street scene and so enable the building to retain an appearance of generally being set in from the edge of the site and so broadly conform to the area's prevailing character and appearance.

¹ The London Plan 2021

6. Whilst the proposed development would not increase the footprint of the existing property and be built of matching materials, it would increase the size and bulk of the building. Accordingly, it would appear very obvious in the street scene, eroding the character of the area by bringing the building noticeably closer to the side boundary of the site.
7. The proposed extension would be set down from the main roof, set back from the front elevation of the property and set in slightly from the side boundary. However, as a result, there would be a number of competing roof forms, extensions and heights across the building which, given the building's prominent corner position, would be clearly visible and which cumulatively would give the building a somewhat incongruous and over-extended appearance.
8. As such, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and wider street scene. This harm would lead to conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan, Policy CS1B of the Core Strategy² and Policy DM1 of the Local Plan³ which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is sympathetic to its surroundings and extensions respect their host buildings. The proposal would also be contrary to the Council's Residential Design Guide⁴, which seeks to ensure that extensions do not have an unacceptable bulk and prominence. The harm I have found would also lead to conflict with the Framework⁵, in particular paragraph 127, which amongst other things, seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to its built environment.

Other Matters

9. I note that there are a number of other altered dwellings which are visible within the street scene, some of which have gabled roofs. There are also examples of extensions which come close to road junctions. However, these appear to assimilate acceptably in terms of their design and do not, based on what I have seen, harm the character and appearance of the street scene in the same way the appeal proposals would.
10. I have had regard to the appeal decisions provided by the appellant and acknowledge that the appellant has tried to produce a subordinate extension with fenestration to reflect the existing style. I also note that the choice of a gable roof would be similar to that of the adjoining dwelling. However, these factors do not diminish the cumulative harm that I have identified in this particular case, which must be determined on its own merits, and so do not lead me to allowing the appeal.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Stewart Glassar
INSPECTOR

² Harrow Core Strategy (2012)

³ Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013)

⁴ Harrow Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Design Guide (2010)

⁵ National Planning Policy Framework (2019)