



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: 22 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/24/3348221

2A Dale Avenue, Edgware, Harrow HA8 6AE

- 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 Kerai against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/0968/24.
 - The development proposed is single and two storey side to rear extensions; two rear dormers (demolition of detached shed, store, single storey side projection and attached garage).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Procedural Matter

2. Planning permission for a pair of two storey three bedroom semi-detached houses to replace the existing house on this site was previously dismissed at appeal (Ref: APP/M5450/W/22/3313135). I have had regard to that 'dismissed appeal' in my decision.
3. I have taken the description of this proposal from part E of the householder planning appeal form, which is consistent with the Council's decision notice.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The host is prominently located on the corner of Dale Avenue and Camrose Avenue. I observed that the properties around this junction, and around the opposite junction with St Bride's Avenue, are generally set well back from the roads, thus giving the immediate locality a fairly spacious ambience.
6. The proposed single storey extension would wrap around the rear and side of the host, replacing a rather tired-looking garage. That garage virtually abuts the side boundary of the plot, such that its upper section can be seen above the fence from the adjacent pavement and nearby bus stop on Camrose Avenue, although its limited depth tempers its visual impact.

7. The proposed ground floor side extension would be similar in height to the garage it would replace. However, whilst the principal parties disagree with regards to its depth measurement, it would extend well beyond the existing garage's rear wall. As a result, viewed from the highway, the top section of its long flank wall, which would be around 3 metres high and would abut the boundary, would be prominent above the timber fence. Thus, notwithstanding the demolition of a small store, the extension would significantly reduce the prevailing sense of openness in this part of the streetscene.
8. Additionally, as demonstrated by Proposed Perspective View 1, it would have a very squat and elongated appearance which, in this prominent position, would contrast awkwardly with the original building's style, with its sloping roofs, architectural detailing, and more articulated form.
9. The appellant maintains that the design of the single storey extensions in this scheme is the same as in the dismissed appeal, and that the Inspector raised no objection to that part of that proposal. However, that Inspector observed that as the main two storey bulk of the existing dwelling is set several metres in from the side boundary, it maintains the spacious character of the appeal site and its surroundings. Having regard to Exhibit A, the single storey side extension proposed in this scheme would abut a much longer stretch of Camrose Avenue compared to the dismissed appeal.
10. The Council considers that the proposed first floor and roof level extensions would appear sympathetic to the main house and would not harmfully impact the streetscene. Having regard to their broadly subordinate scale, their set-in from the plot boundaries, and their set-down from the host's ridge, I agree.
11. However, notwithstanding the proposed use of matching materials, the single storey side extension would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would therefore conflict with London Plan 2021 Policy D3 Part D1), Harrow Core Strategy 2012 Policy CS 1 Part B, 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, distinctiveness and context, having regard to matters such as layout, spacing, massing, bulk, scale, form, appearance, shape, and proportions.
12. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework requirement for high quality design which is sympathetic to the surrounding built environment; and with the advice in the Harrow Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2010 that extensions should harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building, and should not dominate it, or the wider streetscape.

Other matters

13. The appellant is concerned about the Council's handling of his application, including that it did not review his Planning Statement, or the dismissed appeal. However, those documents are referred to in its decision notice or delegated application report, and I have considered them here. I have very little evidence to enable me to assess the appellant's assertion that the Council stated that an acceptable ground floor extension limit would be 129sqm, and my decision is based on this scheme's overall planning merits.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons, the scheme would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. Consequently, having regard to all other matters raised, including a local representation, the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR