



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 May 2023

by K Lancaster BA (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/23/3316122

88 Oakleigh Avenue, Edgware, Harrow, HA8 5DP

- 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 Gigi Necula against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3034/22, dated 20 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. When I visited the site, I observed that the development is substantially complete. As I did not enter the site, it was not possible to ascertain whether the extension has been built fully in accordance with the submitted plans. Accordingly, I have considered the appeal based on the 'proposed' plans.
3. The appellant has indicated their intention to submit amended plans, which would alter the height of the extension and its roofline. These plans were not submitted with the application and therefore have not been the subject of any consultation. Therefore, I consider that other parties would be prejudiced should I take them into account. Furthermore, the advice contained within the Procedural Guide: Planning Appeals – England¹ 2023 states that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and it is important that what is considered is essentially what was considered by the local planning authority. Accordingly, I have not taken them into account in coming to my decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling situated in a prominent position on the corner of Oakleigh Avenue and Broomgrove Gardens. It is a mostly residential area, with a mix of semi-detached and terraced properties. Both the appeal property and its adjoining neighbour have been extended, with the appeal property having a large two-storey side extension and rear single storey extension.

¹ Paragraph 16.1.1

6. This appeal concerns a single storey extension to the side of the property, which extends the full depth of the extended property and all the way to the side boundary. It is proposed that the roof of the extension would be finished in a brown clay tile to match that of the main house. The extension is located immediately behind a high boundary wall, and by virtue of its siting, most of the extension is not unduly prominent within the street scene. However, its large expanse of roof is highly visible above the boundary wall, particularly from Broomgrove Gardens. Due to its scale, it is a dominant and discordant feature when viewed from the surrounding area.
7. The side extension has an awkward relationship to the existing side and rear extensions, which are significant in scale and dominate the original dwelling and its corner plot. As such, although this extension is more modest in scale, the cumulative effect of the extensions results in a disproportionate scale of development that fails to reflect the scale of the original dwelling. As such, the general arrangement, bulk, and mass of the extensions when viewed as a whole have a detrimental impact on the character of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
8. I acknowledge that the gap between the house and the boundary wall would not be particularly large if the extension was removed, and that the appellant questions the usability of this space. Nevertheless, in visual terms, this gap, albeit modest, would minimise some of the overall bulky appearance of the existing extensions.
9. Consequently, I therefore conclude that the single storey side extension causes harm to the character and appearance of the area. It therefore conflicts with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012 (CS), Policy DM1 of the Development Management Development Plan Document 2013 (DPD). These policies state that proposals which fail to achieve a high standard of design, or which are detrimental to local character and appearance, will be resisted.
10. The extension is also contrary to guidance contained within the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2010 which states that side extensions on corner sites should reflect the pattern of development in the street scene, with consideration given to its bulk, visual impact, and relationship to the site boundaries.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, having regard to all the policies brought to my attention, the conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policy CS1.B of the Harrow CS 2012, Policy DM1 of the DPD leads me to conclude that there is conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations which would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

K Lancaster

INSPECTOR