



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2023 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/23/3317036

86A Arundel Drive, Harrow, HA2 8PP

- 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 T. Suthaharan against the decision of the London Borough of Harrow Council.
 - The application Ref P/3813/22, dated 3 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is a part single storey and first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. On my site visit I observed that some works have taken place which include a hip to gable roof conversion. The existing plans submitted by the appellant are therefore not reflective of the current situation on-site, however, for the purposes of this appeal I will only be considering the scheme as proposed during the application stage.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on the northern side of Arundel Drive within an established residential area characterised by semi-detached properties, many of which feature rear and side extensions. I did not observe any two-storey chamfered extensions in the direct vicinity of the appeal site.
 6. The appellant argues that the proposed first floor rear extension would be well designed, would harmonise with the host dwelling, and be finished with sympathetic materials. However, it is quite evident that the incorporation of a chamfered element within the development is included as a device to overcome
-

a potential adverse impact on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers of No. 86 Arundel Drive. The resultant extension would appear awkwardly disjointed and bland due to the lack of fenestration on two of the three exterior walls that comprise the extension. The development would jar with the architectural form of the host dwelling which is characterised by a conventional design incorporating straight side walls. I concur with the Council in that the resultant roof form would be distorted and would unbalance the appearance of the property.

7. I appreciate that the development would be located to the rear of the dwelling and would therefore not feature prominently in the street scene, however, the awkward and disjointed appearance of the development would be visible to surrounding occupiers on Arundel Drive. Indeed, the chamfered element would be visible from the rear elevations and gardens of the neighbouring properties to the northeast. I find that it would be poorly designed and would constitute a discordant and incongruous addition to the appeal dwelling. Therefore, the development would detract from the character of the main dwelling and the surrounding area.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to the varied nature and design of other developments in the area, including a property with a first-floor chamfered design at No. 124 Arundel Drive. However, from the evidence before me, the extension at No. 124 appears to be fully chamfered rather than partially chamfered like the proposal. It also appears to be comparatively small in scale with very limited depth making this development materially different to the one before me. The appellant also refers to several single storey extensions which bear no resemblance to the proposed development. Furthermore, whilst Nos. 80, 82 and 84 demonstrate there are indeed many two-storey extensions of varying scales and designs in the surrounding area, these are not comparable to the proposed development and support further that each proposal must be considered on its own individual merits.
9. The proposal would therefore adversely impact the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. It would conflict with Policy D3 of the *London Plan* (2021), Policy CS1 of Harrow Council's *Core Strategy* (2012), Policy DM1 of the *Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan* (2013) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which together seek to ensure proposals are well designed and contribute positively to the character and appearance of the surrounding area in which they lie. Lastly, the proposal would conflict with the *Residential Design Guide* (2010) Supplementary Planning Document which specifically states that the chamfering of extensions is not normally acceptable.

Other matters

10. I recognise the importance that the enlargement of the property would play in providing additional living space for the current occupiers. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that improvements to the accommodation and layout sufficient to meet the needs of the occupants could be achieved with an alternative and more sympathetic design that would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Recommendation

11. The proposal would adversely impact the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Given this, the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the NPPF, which outweigh this finding.
12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR