



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 May 2022

**by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 25 June 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3295877**

**26 Kenton Lane, HARROW, HA3 8TX**

- 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 Harish Jeshani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
  - The application Ref P/4672/21, dated 24 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2022.
  - The development proposed is described as the construction of a part single-storey rear extension, part first-floor rear and side extension, with insertion of 2 roof lights and associated internal alterations.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Harish Jeshani against the Council of the London Borough of Harrow. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed side and rear extensions on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the neighbouring properties in the locality along Kenton Lane.

## Reasons

4. No 26 is a semi-detached house situated on the eastern side of Kenton Lane. Kenton Lane is a busy road, characterised in the vicinity of the appeal property largely by semi-detached houses of similar design. No 26 was undergoing construction work at the time of my visit which appeared to include a hip-to-gable conversion with a large rear roof dormer. A previously existing single-storey side extension had been largely demolished.
5. The proposed development would include the construction of a replacement side extension with a single-storey projection beyond the line of the rear elevation of the earlier demolished extension. The extension as a whole would be part two-storey and part single-storey. The two-storey element would wrap around part of the rear elevation. The two-storey element would have a hipped roof to the side of the gable elevation and also across the rear elevation, such that its roof would obscure part of the rear dormer.

6. Policy CS1 of the Council's Core Strategy (CS) indicates that new development should protect the character of Harrow's suburbs. Policy DM1 of the Council's Development Management Policies document (DMP) indicates that all development must achieve a high standard of design and layout. The assessment of this should have regard to the massing, bulk, scale and height of proposed buildings in relation to the location and the surroundings; the appearance of proposed buildings, including detailing and roof form; and the context provided by neighbouring buildings and the local character.
7. The Harrow Residential Design Guide (SPD) includes guidance for Householder Development. This indicates that extensions should represent an additional volume subordinate to, and reflecting, the character of the original house, or a simple extension of the existing building form. In addition, an extension should have a sense of proportion and balance, both in its own right and in its relationship to the original building and should not dominate the original building, whilst roof design is very important because this will determine the overall shape of the extension. All roofs should be designed to reflect the character of the dwelling house and those adjoining to provide a satisfactory appearance.
8. With specific regard to side extensions, the SPD indicates that they should reflect the pattern of development in the street scene. The visual impact of side extensions, particularly first-floor and two-storey, will be assessed against the pattern of development in the immediate locality. Moreover, where the property has already been extended by the conversion of a hipped to a gabled roof, a further side extension (first-floor or two-storey) is inappropriate.
9. The Council contends that the first-floor side to rear extension, by reason of its poor and incompatible design, excessive width, and contrived roof design in conjunction with the existing hip-to-gable elevation and rear dormer, would introduce bulky, incongruous and disproportionate additions of overall poor design that would be harmful to the rear elevation of the existing dwelling and the character and appearance of the neighbouring properties.
10. The appellant contends that the proposed extension is modest in scale and is a respectful addition to the area, matching the character of the surrounding properties. The extensions would result in no harm to neighbouring properties in terms of residential amenity and appearance, and would promote positive improvements with benefits to the surrounding area. He also points to a number of other examples of similar first-floor side extensions at properties in the surrounding area that have been approved by the Council or on appeal.
11. In this case, No 26 forms part of a short run of properties that have all apparently been the subject of hip-to-gable roof conversions. These properties are Nos 22 – 30. None of these houses currently have two-storey side extensions. All other properties in the surrounding area retain hipped roofs, including Nos 7 and 9 opposite, which have two-storey side extensions with subordinate extensions to the hipped roof of the main building.
12. The proposed extension would be set back around 1 metre behind the main front elevation and would have a roof height below that of the main roof ridge and dormer roof. In this regard, therefore, it would appear subservient to the main house in the street scene. However, the width of the rear extension, which would be more than 50% of the width of the house, would appear as an over-dominant feature at the rear of the house.

13. In addition, the hipped roof of the extension, when seen in the context of the large gable-end side elevation and dormer cheeks, would appear out of character with its immediate surroundings, where gable-end elevations have become a feature. It would appear incongruous and contrived in the context both of the host property and the neighbouring houses in the immediate locality. Moreover, the hipped roof at the rear of the extension would cut across the face of the rear dormer and appear as an awkward feature in the overall appearance of the rear of the house.
14. The appellant has referred to a number of two-storey side extensions that have been approved in the wider area over the past decade and before. I note these examples. However, it would appear that almost all have involved the use of hipped roofs to match the main roof of the host property. These appear as subordinate to, and reflecting, the character of the original house, and/or are a simple extension of the existing building form. This would not be the case with the proposal at the appeal property.
15. More specifically, the appellant makes reference to an extension at No 144 Streatfield Road, which has a side extension exhibiting a hipped roof against a hip-to-gable extension. However, in this case, it would appear that at the time of the Council's consideration of the case, the proposed hipped roof was intended to match the existing main hipped roof. I have no details of any subsequent approval relating to, what I assume, was a subsequent hip-to-gable development. In any case, I consider the current situation at No 144 now to be inappropriate and harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
16. With regard to another extension at 79 Kenton Park Crescent, allowed on appeal, I note that the design is somewhat different from that of this proposal, and the property is located towards the end of a cul-de-sac, and is therefore not prominent visually. All other cases referred to by the appellants appear to relate to side extensions with hipped roofs, where the host property retained the original hipped roof in the main house. In any event, I have dealt with this case on its own merits, in the context of its effect on the host property, the immediate neighbouring properties, and the wider surrounding area, including its visual impact on the streetscape of this busy road.
17. On the matter of scale and massing, the side extension, by virtue of its limited height and width, would appear subservient to the main dwelling when viewed from the street. However, by virtue of its width, the wrap-around side/rear extension would appear to dominate the rear of the property. Whilst this harm would be limited in itself, it would add to the harm caused to the character and appearance of the host property by the incongruous roof design of the proposed extensions, particularly as seen against the gable end of the side elevation of the house and by cutting across the rear elevation of its dormer.
18. In conclusion on the main issue, I find that the design and detailing of the side/rear extension, with particular reference to the roof, would lack coherence in the context of the main house. It would appear incongruous, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host property. Furthermore, in the context of the immediate neighbouring houses, all of which appear to have had hip-to-gable conversions but with no side extensions, the use of an arrangement of hipped roof elements for the proposed extension at No 26, would result in a development inappropriate to its surroundings.

### **Other Matter**

19. The Council contends that the proposed elevations and floorplans exhibit inconsistencies in drawing scale with the proposed site plan which shows the enlarged footprint of the dwelling, and that this prevents the Council from being able to make an accurate assessment of the proposal in terms of its impact to the neighbouring residential amenities at No 24 Kenton Lane. Regardless of any such possible inconsistencies, it would appear from my site visit and the physical relationship of the two properties within their individual plots, that there is very little likelihood that the proposed extensions at No 26 would have any significant harmful impacts on the residential amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring No 24.

### **Conclusion**

20. I find that the proposed side/rear extension, by virtue of its incongruous and inappropriate roof detail, in the context of its relationship to the side gable and the rear dormer, would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and would not, therefore, represent a high quality design. In addition, it would appear out of character and context with the neighbouring properties in the immediate locality, which have gabled side elevations and no side/rear extensions. On this basis, the proposal would conflict with Policy CS1 of the CS, Policy DM1 of the DMP, and guidance on Household Extensions given in the SPD. Accordingly, I dismiss this appeal.

*J D Westbrook*

INSPECTOR