



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 March 2023

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/23/3314136

31 Fairview Crescent, Harrow, HA2 9UB

- 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 & Mrs Falloon against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3195/22, dated 7 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 2 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of first floor wrap-around side/rear extension and ground floor infill rear extension with new rooflight.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the first floor wrap-around side/rear extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the ground floor infill rear extension with new rooflight and planning permission is granted for ground floor infill rear extension with new rooflight at 31 Fairview Crescent, Harrow, HA2 9UB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/3195/22, dated 7 September 2022, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Dwg Nos: FC/2022/01; FC/2022/02; FC/2022/03; FC/2022/04; FC/2022/05 and FC/2022/06.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Fairview Crescent is a suburban road consisting of 2 storey dwellings in terraces of 4 houses, or pairs of semi-detached houses. They have a distinctive character derived from their common design features. These include 2 storey bays joined with those of neighbouring houses under a shared gable roof with

mock-Tudor beams, small first floor bay windows above tiled porch canopies, and hipped roofs.

4. Several houses, including the appeal property, have hip to gable extensions. These give an unbalanced appearance which is particularly noticeable on semi-detached houses, such as the appeal property, where the adjoining house retains its original hipped roof. The proposed 2 storey pitched roof side extension would add to the visual imbalance that currently exists and would conflict with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010) (SPD) which advises that further side extensions are inappropriate where a property has already had a hip to gable roof extension. Also, it would be particularly obtrusive given that most other side extensions in the street have hipped roofs, reflecting the original roof form on their respective host properties.
5. I appreciate that where the proposed extension would wrap around the rear it would only be visible at close quarters by immediate neighbours and would be lower than the side element and less obtrusive from rear views. Nonetheless, it would in combination with the different roof forms proposed, and in addition to the existing roof dormer, give rise to unacceptable visual clutter. In any case it is not physically severable from the side extension which I have also found would be unacceptable and would harm the appearance of the host property and wider street scene. These elements of the proposal would not therefore accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021), Core Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies (2013) and the SPD which require a high standard of design that respects the host dwelling and responds to local character.

Other Matters

6. The ground floor rear of the appeal property includes a back door within a projecting bay which sits behind the building line of the adjacent rear living room. The proposed ground floor rear extension would replace the bay and extend the wall out in line with the living room wall, and that of the rear wall of the neighbouring house and be of a similar height. As such it would respect the proportion, scale and form of the host property and that of its neighbour. I therefore agree with the assessment in the Council's Officer Report that it would be an acceptable form of development. As it is physically and functionally severable from the first floor extensions, I consider a split decision would be appropriate to allow planning permission for this element of the proposal.
7. I have had regard to the contribution that construction can make to the local economy and the increasing demand for space to accommodate homeworking and extended households. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
8. A neighbour raised concerns over the first floor rear extension regarding overshadowing and outlook. However, these do not add to my reasons for dismissing the appeal in respect of that element of the proposal.

Conclusion and Conditions

For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed in relation to the ground floor infill rear extension. However, in relation to the first floor wrap-around side and rear extension the appeal should be dismissed.

9. I have attached the standard time limit condition and a plans condition as this provides certainty. I have also added a condition concerning materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance. Other conditions suggested by the Council are not necessary as they relate to elements of the proposal that I have dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR