The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2022

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3302969
45 Courtfield Avenue, Harrow, HA1 2LB

- 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 Nandini Bagade against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
- The application Ref P/0879/22, dated 25 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 April 2022.
- The development proposed is a double storey side extension, double storey rear extension and front porch.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. A previous application[1] for a side extension was recently refused. The appellant notes that the proposal the subject of this appeal reduces the width of the proposed side extension compared to the previously refused proposal, and "trades off" this lost floor space with a modest first floor rear extension.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a single storey attached garage to the side. The dwelling has a rear dormer roof extension and is set back from the road behind a parking area and has a garden to the rear.

5. The surrounding area is residential and is characterised by the presence of two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings set back from the road behind short front gardens and/or parking areas and with longer gardens to the rear.

6. During my site visit, I observed the area to appear green and spacious due in part to the presence of wide pavements with grass verges, occasional street trees, planting to front garden areas and glimpses through the gaps between dwellings to space and greenery beyond. The common presence of bay

[1] Ref: P/2062/21.

windows, along with brick, render and tiling provides for a pleasant sense of uniformity.

7. I also noted during my site visit that whilst many dwellings have been altered and/or extended, such changes tend to appear in keeping with the host property and the surrounding area.

8. The existing dwelling has previously been extended through a hip to gable roof extension. The proposed development would involve a two storey side extension alongside this previous extension. This would result in visual inconsistency between the existing and proposed roof form.

9. Resultantly, I find that the proposal would draw attention to itself as an awkward and incoherent addition, out of keeping with the host property and entirely at odds with the wider roofscape along Courtfield Avenue.

10. The harm arising from this would be exacerbated as a result of the roof to the proposed rear extension failing to correspond with, or respond appropriately to, the gable end roof form of the host property. Taken together, the side and rear extension would appear as an awkward, bulky and incongruous addition. It would comprise visual clutter and would draw the eye as an alien feature, out of keeping with its surroundings.

11. Taking the above into account, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to London Plan (2021) Policy D3; to Core Strategy[2] Policy CS1; to DMP[3] Policy DM1 and to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

12. In support of the proposal, the appellant draws attention to other developments elsewhere. However, there is nothing before me to demonstrate that any other development is so similar to that proposed as to provide for direct comparison. Notwithstanding this, I have found that the proposal would result in harm and this is not a matter mitigated or outweighed by the presence of other developments elsewhere.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

[2] Reference: Harrow Core Strategy (2012).
[3] Reference: Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).