



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2024

by L Clark BA(HONS) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/24/3346722

51 Anglesmede Crescent, Pinner HA5 5ST

- 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 Mr Raj Maisuria against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/0427/24.
 - The development proposed is single-storey front extension incorporating porch; single and two-storey side to rear extension; single-storey rear extension; rooflights in side roofslope; external alterations (demolition of attached garage and side extension).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The proposal is for a single-storey front extension incorporating porch; single and two-storey side to rear extension; a single-storey rear extension; rooflights to the side roofslope and external alterations, following the demolition of the attached garage and side extension. The Council has indicated that it has no objection to the above apart from the two-storey side to rear extension. Based on the evidence, I have no reason to take a different view; this therefore shall be the focus of my assessment.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the two-storey side-to-rear extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site (No 51) is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling which has previously been extended and incorporates a hip-to-gable over the main dwelling and a flat roof dormer to the rear roof slope. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached houses with predominantly hipped roofs.
5. In assessing the appropriateness of the proposal, the Council has drawn my attention to its Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide, 2010 (SPD), specifically to paragraphs in Chapter 6. The purpose of the SPD is amongst other matters, to ensure that the visual impact of side extensions, particularly first floor and two storeys, reflect the pattern of development in the street scene and that extensions harmonise with the architectural style of the original building. Moreover, it states that "where the property has already been extended by the conversion of a hipped to a gabled roof, a further side

extension (first floor or two-storey) is inappropriate. Such developments are incompatible with the design, character, bulk and appearance of the locality". Given that the roof of No 51 has been altered from a hip to a gable, the proposed two-storey side to rear extension would conflict with the SPD.

6. Moreover, even if the proposed development would be set back behind the main front elevation and the roof subservient to that of the main dwelling, the design of the roof would be at odds with the gable roof of the host dwelling. This would result in an awkward and disjointed relationship between the two which would materially detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the surrounding area.
7. Turning to the proposed side to rear extension in conjunction with the existing dormer, given its position and the orientation of the surrounding buildings, it is unlikely that this element would be readily visible from within the street scene. As such, its addition to the already extended dwelling would not result in material harm to the character and appearance of either No 51 or the surrounding area.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to the presence of a similar extension at 14 Anglesmede Crescent (No 14) which was allowed retrospectively at appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3306774. I acknowledge the proposed development would be similar to that at No 14, however, the Inspector is clear that those extensions to No 14 were a result of a Lawful Development Certificate¹ (LDC) and planning permission² (2018 PP) which preceded the appeal, and the appeal sought to amalgamate the LDC and the 2018 PP. As such, this was the starting point for the Inspector which is not the case with the appeal before me. The circumstances relating to No 14 are therefore not directly comparable to the appeal before me.
9. The appellant has also drawn my attention to a number of properties identified on their 'Aerial plan', which they contend have gable roofs. Whilst I have seen gable roofs to properties on Anglesmede Crescent, with the exception of application P/2324/22 (No 14), I have not been provided with the circumstances relating to their presence. Furthermore, whilst these properties have gables, I cannot be certain whether the side elements are extensions or original to the main dwelling. As such, I do not consider their presence to be comparable to the appeal before me.
10. I conclude that the two-storey side to rear extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, contrary to Policies D3 (D(1) and D(11)) of the London Plan (2021), Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and Policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies (2013) which collectively 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 the Council's SPD which, amongst other matters, advises that further extensions are inappropriate where a property has already had a hip to gable extension. There would also be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks, amongst other matters, for development to be sympathetic to local character.

¹ P/5682/18 dated 19 February 2019

² P/4662/18 dated 14 December 2018

Other Matters

11. I acknowledge that the proposal would extend the size of an existing family dwelling however, no evidence has been provided to demonstrate the need for such an extension. As such, the benefits of having a larger dwelling do not outweigh the harm that would be caused.
12. The absence of harm to the living conditions of residents of No 49 and 53 with regard to outlook is a neutral matter in the overall planning balance, as this would be a likely requirement of a well-designed development.
13. Even if the existing garage is 'underused' and the proposed development would be built from similar materials, maintaining access to the rear garden and is within a sustainable location, these matters do not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area which is a matter of overriding concern.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no other considerations which indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Clark

INSPECTOR