



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2024

by H Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/24/3347145

676 Kenton Lane, Harrow Weald, Harrow HA3 6AA

- 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 Boca against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/0467/24.
 - The development proposed is ground floor extension to rear, two storey extension to side and rear to replace existing garage, dormer to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for ground floor extension to rear, two storey extension to side and rear to replace existing garage, dormer to rear at 676 Kenton Lane, Harrow Weald, Harrow HA3 6AA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/0467/24, 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:

P1-1 P01
P1-2 P01
P1-3 P01
P1-4 P01
P2-1 P01
P2-2 P01
P2-3 P01
P3-1 P01
P4-1 P01
P4-2 P01
- 3) No development above ground level (other than any demolition) shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 12 December 2024, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. I have had regard to the revised Framework insofar as it is relevant to this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. No 676 Kenton Lane (No 676) is a traditionally designed semi-detached house incorporating bay windows to its front elevation. It is served by a large rear garden and a smaller front garden. To the south of the property there is a grass verge, a private drive leading to a residential development and a pub car park. With the pub and also some shops nearby, there are a mix of building uses in the area, but the surroundings to the appeal site are predominately residential in character, and they include many other traditionally designed houses. Many of these houses have been the subject of a variety of extensions and alterations.
5. At first floor level, the proposed side extension's west facing elevation would be quite narrow, and it would result in a proportionate widening of the host property's frontage. Upon completion of the proposal, the property's bay windows would be retained, and it would still be served by a single storey front projection containing the entrance door. Therefore, although the proposed side extension would not incorporate a recess, nor a step-down to its roof ridge, these factors would combine to ensure that it would not appear unduly dominant, and further ensure variety to the composition of the extended property's front elevation and serve to break-up its mass. Furthermore, the presence of the grass verge, private drive and pub car park means that no residential properties are nearby to the property's south. Therefore, even though the two storey side and rear extensions would be right beside the site boundary, a clear physical separation and visual distinction of the host property would be maintained and, as a consequence, a harmful terracing effect would not arise.
6. The roof ridge of the two storey rearward extension would step-down. Coupled with the hipped roof design, this would successfully reduce the extension's bulk even though it would be quite prominently positioned given No 676 is a corner plot. Incorporating a flat roof, the ground floor rear extension would have a low-slung appearance and would represent a clearly subservient addition to the house. The proposed rear dormer would be set-down from the roof ridge, set-back from the eaves and set-in from the roof's edges. As a result, the proposed dormer would not dominate the roofscape and would form a sympathetic and subordinate addition to the property's roof.
7. Therefore, even though the array of extensions proposed would amount to a marked enlargement and alteration of the host property, they would each be well-designed and, collectively, would remain sympathetic to it. During my visit, I also noted the appearance of the adjoining, extended semi-detached house. Even though this adjoining house may have been extended incrementally, the extensions implemented are similar to those proposed at the host property.

Consequently, upon completion of the proposed development, the pair of semi-detached houses would, appropriately, exhibit much design cohesion.

8. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would be acceptably designed, and it would result in no harmful effects upon the character and appearance of the host property or the area. The proposal accords with Policy D3 of the London Plan, Policy CS 1 of the Harrow Core Strategy and Policy DM 1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies document. In summary, and amongst other matters, these policies require development proposals to achieve a high standard of design, positively respond to local character and distinctiveness and, in specific regard to extensions, to respect their host building.
9. The Harrow Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) includes some prescriptive guidance in relation to the design of extensions. However, it also emphasises that site considerations and the character of the locality should also be assessed when reviewing the acceptability of extensions. As the proposal would be well-designed, and would have an acceptable relationship with both the host property and the street scene, I find that it is, overall, compliant with the SPD's guidance which seeks to ensure residential developments achieve a high standard of design.
10. Finally, the proposal also complies with those policies within the Framework which seek to ensure the creation of high quality buildings, and developments which are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

11. I have imposed the standard time limit condition. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary in the interests of certainty.
12. To protect the character and appearance of the area, a condition is also needed to secure the appropriate use of materials. Although the Council suggested that such a condition stipulate that proposed materials should match the existing property, the appellant's evidence indicates that they seek materials more akin to those used in the adjoining property. Therefore, to permit this to be resolved and in the interests of certainty, the condition I have imposed requires the details of proposed materials to be submitted and agreed.

Conclusion

13. The proposed development accords with the development plan, and there are no material considerations which indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the conditions above.

H Jones

INSPECTOR