



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2024

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/24/3348682

43 Prescelly Place, Edgware, Harrow HA8 6DH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Emmanuel Akubue against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/0630/24.
 - The development proposed is a 3 metre first floor side extension with a double pitch roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. Nos 43 and 41 Prescelly Place form a semi-detached pair, which have single storey rear extensions, and which are prominently positioned on the corner with Tenby Road. Unlike its attached neighbour, the host also has a long, flat-roofed single storey side extension and, compared to it, a much larger rear dormer. Although the principal roofs of most nearby properties are mostly hipped, this pair's originally hipped roof has been converted to gables.
4. The proposed first floor extension would sit above part of the host's single storey side extension. It would be set down below the host's ridge and recessed behind its front face, thus providing some articulation.
5. However, having regard to the cumulative impact with previous development, the first floor extension with a gable would give this half of the pair a considerable mass. Whilst the gabled extension would reflect the host's current form, having regard to its height and proximity to the pavement, it would have a domineering bulk in this part of the streetscene. Most nearby corner properties, including those on Nolton Place with two storey projections close to Tenby Road, finish with a hipped roof on their upper floor, thus resulting in a smoother, less abrupt, transition to the Tenby Road streetscene.
6. As it would not reflect the pair's original roof form, the scheme would conflict with the advice at paragraph 6.42 of the Harrow Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2010. Of greater concern, it would also

conflict with its stance at paragraph 6.66 that roof alterations should complement the original street character, and should not dominate buildings or impair their proportions or character; and with its advice at paragraph 6.57 that where a property has already been extended by the conversion of a hipped to a gabled roof, a further side extension will be inappropriate given that it may be incompatible with the design and appearance of the locality.

7. The Council describes this scheme as almost identical to a previous scheme on this site that was dismissed at appeal (Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3268007), but I have not been provided with any details to enable me to make a comparison. Whilst the appellant has provided a brief summary and photographs of hipped roofed side extensions following hip to gable conversions, I have limited details of those; and as none are on Prescelly Place or Tenby Road, they form no part of these streetscenes.
8. For the above reasons, notwithstanding the proposed use of matching materials, the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
9. It would thereby conflict with London Plan 2021 ('LP') Policy D3, and Harrow Development Management Policies 2013 Policy DM 1. Amongst other things, these require a high standard of design which respects the host building, and responds positively to local character and distinctiveness and the context provided by neighbouring buildings, having regard to matters such as building types, form, proportions, massing, bulk, scale, height and appearance.
10. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework') requirement for high quality design which is visually attractive and sympathetic to the surrounding built environment. Whilst the Framework provides qualified support for upward extensions, it would not accord with its stance that they should be consistent with the prevailing form of nearby properties and the overall streetscene. In its favour, the scheme finds limited support from LP and Framework policies which seek to optimise site potential, enhance living conditions, and make an efficient use of land.
11. Finally, although the Council has provided me with LP Policy D7, as that addresses the need to provide accessible housing, it is not relevant to the main issue in this appeal.
12. The scheme's limited benefits would not outweigh the significant harm that it would cause to the character and appearance of the host property and the area, and it would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. Thus, having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR