



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2023

by L Clark BA(HONS) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/23/3318551

176 Camrose Avenue, Edgware, HA8 6BU

- 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 Neelan Santhirarajah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
- The application Ref P/4961/21, dated 31 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 December 2022.
- The development proposed is demolition of side garage and erection of two storey side and single storey rear extension and conversion of the dwellinghouse into 2 self-contained dwellinghouses (1x2 bed and 1x3 bed) and subdivision of rear garden.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed two storey rear extension on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area; and
 - Whether future intended occupiers would be likely to experience acceptable living conditions, with particular regards to internal living space and storage.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a single storey extension to the side and cantilevered porch to the front, situated on a corner plot with No 1 Merlin Crescent (No 1) and within a predominantly residential area of similar two storey properties. The property benefits from a triangular plot with a long front garden, with planting towards the junction with Merlin Crescent and gardens to the side and rear laid to lawn set behind a hedge boundary.
4. As the property occupies a prominent position on Camrose Avenue the proposed side extension would be readily visible from the street scene. The stepping out of the rear element and its projection beyond the rear main wall would result in the need of a distinct roof design. Whilst I note that the roof reflects that of the host property and those within the surrounding area, the incorporation of a stepped building line and staggered roof which also incorporates an extended overhang to the eaves, would increase the bulk of the extension. This would result in both the extension and roof appearing at

odds with the overall proportions of the host property and appearing as an incongruent addition within the surrounding area.

5. I accept that the two storey side extension would retain space to the side of the property however this does not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
6. The Council have no concerns regarding the proposed single storey rear extension or the two storey side extension in terms of its set back at first floor, the incorporation of a hipped roof or the degree to which the roof is set down below the roof of the main house.
7. I conclude that whilst the side extension would appear subordinate to the host property when viewed from the front, this is not the case when viewed from the side and rear. The rear element of the two storey side extension would fail to respect the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with Policy D3 of the London Plan, Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) (Core Strategy) and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies (HDMP). Taken together, these policies seek to ensure high levels of design and that extensions respect the host building and respond to the existing character. It would also conflict with guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide SPD: RDG which recommends, amongst other matters, that side extensions on corner sites reflect the pattern of development in the street scene. There would also be conflict with the Framework, which seeks, amongst other matters for development to be sympathetic to local character.

Living Conditions

8. There is dispute between the main parties regarding the level of occupancy and overall Gross Floor Area (GIA) of the dwelling. Submitted plans show two bedrooms of differing sizes within the first floor. No furniture has been shown on submitted plans. Whilst bedroom 2 is the smaller of the two rooms, plans show the room to measure 4.26 metres by 2.44 metres, the width of which exceeds the minimum width of a single bedroom as set out in Policy D6 of the London Plan. The size of the bedroom determines the occupancy level and as such I have assessed the proposal on the basis of a 2 bed/ 3 person dwelling. From the evidence before me the house would have a floor area of 70sqm in accordance with the minimum GIA sought in Policy D6 for a two bed/3 person.
9. Whilst internal storage hasn't been clearly identified, I note the intention is to provide space under the central staircase and within the void area adjacent to the proposed staircase. Whilst volumes of storage have not been included, I consider the proposed locations would provide sufficient storage to meet the requirements within the Policy.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed dwelling would provide future intended occupiers with adequate living conditions to accord with Policy D6 of the London Plan, policies DM1 and DM26 of the HDMP and the SPG:RDG. The proposed dwelling would also accord with the Nationally Described Space Standards and the Mayor of London Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Other Matters

11. Absence of harm of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring residents with regards to light, outlook or sense of enclosure, access to outdoor private amenity space, and parking for intended future occupiers are neutral matters in the overall planning balance as this would be a likely requirement of a well-designed development.

Conclusion

12. The appeal proposal would create one new house, supporting the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. However, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, and this harm would outweigh the benefits associated with the creation of one new dwelling. Therefore, the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole, and there are no material considerations that lead me to find other than in accordance with it. Consequently, the appeal is dismissed.

L Clark

INSPECTOR