



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2024

**by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 9<sup>th</sup> July 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/24/3342622**

**12 Chestnut Avenue, Edgware, Harrow, HA8 7RA**

- 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 Dinesh Vekaria against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
  - The application Ref P/0275/23 dated 25 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 16 February 2024.
  - The development proposed is conversion of garage into habitable space, internal alterations with associated external window/door changes, new roof light, first floor part upper/side extension, loft conversion with rear and side dormers and no. 5 roof lights.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for conversion of garage into habitable space, internal alterations with associated external window/door changes, new roof light, first floor part upper/side extension, loft conversion with rear and side dormers and no. 5 roof lights at 12 Chestnut Avenue, Edgware, Harrow, HA8 7RA in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P/0275/23, dated 25 January 2023 and in accordance with the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision;
  - 2) 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;
  - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 22001 HH1 01.02 Rev C Proposed floor plans, section and elevations.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Canons Park Conservation Area.
-

## Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling situated in a residential area characterised by the presence of similar detached and semi-detached two storey dwellings.
4. The appeal property is located within the Canons Park Conservation Area, characterised by the presence of Tudor revival-style dwellings within a formally planned Metroland estate, notable for its layout of green and spacious streets. Streets include many examples of simple, small, detached and semi-detached two storey dwellings with accommodation at roof level.
5. During my site visit, I noted the sylvan setting of Chestnut Avenue, with its wide street incorporating grass verges and street trees; and with small front gardens and/or parking areas, which provide for the setting back of dwellings behind areas of greenery. Whilst dwellings are located close alongside one another, there is still plentiful scope for glimpses through to the greenery of gardens to the rear.
6. The appeal dwelling, like other houses along Chestnut Avenue, is notable for its traditional appearance, including its attractive two storey bay and gable feature, small integrated front garage, arched doorway and cat-slide roof to the side. Whilst not identical, it appears similar to its attached neighbour, Number 14 Chestnut Avenue and its retention of many traditional features is a characteristic it shares with surrounding dwellings.
7. The appeal dwelling is also similar in appearance to its other immediate neighbour, Number 10 Chestnut Avenue, which is situated closely alongside. The most notable difference between the two dwellings being a side extension to No 10, which faces directly towards the side of the appeal dwelling.
8. The proposed development would include a side dormer. This would be set well-back from the front of the dwelling, thus maintaining the distinctive visual presence of the dwelling's cat-slide roof and integrated garage, seen from the front elevation.
9. Further, the side dormer would be set well-down from the main ridge, resulting in it appearing as a subservient addition. This feature, together with the relatively narrow length, modest projection and setting back of the dormer from the front of the house would result in a modest and attractive addition, carefully designed to appear in keeping with the appearance of the host dwelling.
10. In addition to the above, I find that the proposed side dormer would relate very well to the neighbouring side extension to Number 10. It would add a degree of symmetry to the two immediately adjacent dwellings and I consider that this would be to the benefit of the Canons Park Conservation Area's uniform qualities.
11. In the above regard, the setting back, careful design and modest dimensions of the proposed side dormer would ensure that it would appear neither bulky nor incongruous and that it would maintain and not visually harm, the existing sense of symmetry with the attached dwelling, No 14.
12. As noted above, during my site visit I observed that whilst dwellings tend to be located close alongside one another, there are still occasional glimpses between

dwelling to greenery to the rear. This is achieved via small gaps between dwellings and pairs of dwellings.

13. The proposed side dormer would provide for a small visual gap between the appeal dwelling and No 10 and would, as a consequence, conserve this characteristic which makes a small but positive contribution to the Canons Park Conservation Area's green and spacious qualities.
14. Noting all of the above, I find that the proposed development preserves the character and appearance of the Canons Park Conservation Area. The proposal would not be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework or to London Plan (2021) Policies D3 and HC1; to Development Management Policies (2013) Policies DM1 and DM7; to Harrow Core Strategy (2012) Policy CS1; to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guide (2010); or to the Council's Canons Park Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2013), which together amongst other things seek to protect local character.

### **Conditions**

15. I have considered the conditions against the tests set out in Paragraph 56 of the Framework. I find that a condition specifying the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
16. A condition controlling external surfaces is necessary in the interests of local character.

### **Conclusion**

17. For the reasons given above, the appeal is successful.

*N McGurk*

INSPECTOR