

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2024

by John Whalley

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 JANUARY 2024

Appeal ref: APP/M5450/D/23/3322962

92 Vancouver Road, Edgware HA8 5DF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal of planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Tirup Patel against the decision of the London Borough of Harrow Council.
 - The application, ref. P/0170/23, dated 18 January 2023, was refused by a notice dated 15 March 2023.
 - The development is: Single storey side extension; external alterations (demolition of side extension and garage).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey side extension; external alterations (demolition of side extension and garage), at No. 92 Vancouver Road, Edgware HA8 5DF in accordance with application ref. P/0170/23, dated 18 January 2023, 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: Existing Elevations Page 3 of 4 Rev 1 dated Jan 2023; Existing Ground and Floor Plans Page 1 of 4 Rev 1 dated Jan 2023; Existing Site Plan dated September 2022; H M Land Registry General Map, 92 Vancouver Road; Proposed Elevations Page 4 of 4 Rev 1 dated Jan 2023; Proposed Ground and Floor Plans Page 2 of 4 Rev 1 dated Jan 2023.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details/samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details/samples.

Main issue

2. The decision turns on whether or not the proposed side extension would materially harm this part of the street frontage to Vancouver Road.

Proposal

3. The Appellant, Mr Tirup Patel, wishes to demolish the existing flat roofed single storey side extension to his semi-detached house at No. 92 Vancouver Road, demolish the flat roofed single garage that sits alongside the shared boundary

to No. 90 immediately to the south and remove the high fence to the patio frontage that links the 2 structures. A new predominantly single storey side extension would be built to the side of the house, 5.8m wide and 6.8m deep. The extension would display a false sloping roof with a ridge height of 4m and eaves 3m high to the front, road elevation.

Considerations

4. The Council said the side extension would be unacceptably wide. It would be disproportionate and not subservient to the house. Their Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guide (2010) said: *"Extensions should harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building, and the character of the area. An extension should have a sense of proportion and balance, both in its own right and in its relationship to the original building and should not dominate the original building or surrounding area"*.
5. The Development Plan policies quoted by the Council harmonise with National Planning Policy Framework (2023) guidance at para. 126 - *"The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities."*.
6. The new 5.8m wide side extension to the semi-detached house at No 92 would be 1.2m narrower than a previously refused application, (ref: P/3248/22), bringing it down from the originally proposed same width at the house. In my view, that reduction of Mr Patel's proposed replacement side extension project would be an acceptable alternative. It would replace 2 unprepossessing flat roofed structures, those being a narrow side extension attached to the house and a single garage built up the boundary shared with No. 90 next door. There is a gap of about 3m between those structures, but which is closed by timber fencing to almost the same height. The effect is that the present frontage to the side of the 2 storey semi-detached house at No. 92 completely closes the gap at ground floor level to the side of the 2 storey semi-detached No. 90 when seen from the fronting road, producing a poor overall look. Replacing most of that with the 5.8m wide side extension to Mr Patel's house would be of some minor benefit, not, as the Council suggest, some harm to the street frontage. That is notwithstanding that the width of the new extension would be only some 1.1m less than that of the 2 storey house.

Conclusion

7. I conclude that the appeal extension at No. 92 Vancouver Road would not be in conflict with Policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan which seeks to ensure a high standard of development. A conditional planning permission should be granted.
8. For the reasons given above, the appeal succeeds. A condition limiting the duration of the permission is applied, (s.91 of the Act), as is a condition relating to the submitted plans defining the project and a condition requiring the submission of details of external finishes so they match the main house.

John Whalley

INSPECTOR