



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2025

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/24/3350454

25 Cavendish Drive, Edgware, Harrow HA8 7NR

- 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 Sundeep Gupta against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application reference is P/2704/23.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a part single and part double storey rear extension, part single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey front extension; a single and 2-storey rear extension; a first-floor side extension; a front dormer; 2 roof lights in the front roof slope; and external alterations at 25 Cavendish Drive, Edgware, Harrow HA8 7NR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2704/23, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision.

Procedural matters

2. While the appellant has described the proposal as in the above heading, the Council has referred to it as the erection of a single storey front extension; a single and 2-storey rear extension; a first-floor side extension; a front dormer; 2 roof lights in the front roof slope; and external alterations. From my inspection of the plans, I consider that the Council's description more fully reflects the development sought. I have assessed the proposal on that basis. For accuracy, I have used the Council's description of the development in my decision.
3. On 12 December 2024, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework 2024) was published. The Framework 2024 does not raise any new matters that are determinative to the outcome of this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

5. The Council's objections relate solely to the new single storey front extension and to the proposed dormer, which is to be placed onto the extended front roof slope of No 25. I, too, find the remaining elements of the appeal scheme, which include the rear and side extensions, front roof lights and external alterations, appropriate in

scale, design and general appearance. These changes would broadly respect the character and appearance of the existing property and local area.

6. The proposed single storey front extension would attach to the side of the forward projecting gable to No 25, which is a 2-storey detached dwelling within a mainly residential area. It would a new main entrance to the house. Although sizeable, the proposal would be a proportionate addition given the substantial built form of the host dwelling. Coupled with the use of matching external materials, the new single storey extension would relate reasonably well to the host building. As such, it would not be overly dominant nor obtrusive. Given that the properties on either side of the site both include a similar entrance feature in their principal elevations, as do others in the local area, this aspect of the appeal scheme would not be an uncharacteristic addition nor appear as a discordant element in the streetscape.
7. By introducing an additional dormer, the proposal would add to the scale and bulk of the host building at roof level. Nevertheless, the proposal would be modest in size and set in from the edge of the main roof on all 4 sides. With a good expanse of front roof slope still evident, the new dormer would be a subordinate addition, with the main roof remaining dominant in the building's composition. The new addition would broadly match the style and materials of the existing front dormer and provide a counterbalance to it within the front roof slope. Overall, the completed dwelling would retain its style, proportions and intrinsic character with the new built form in place.
8. I saw that several properties along Cavendish Drive include more than one front dormer. As the Council points out, existing dormers on the same front roof slope of dwellings close to the site often differ in size to each other. As the new addition would include a smaller opening and fewer windows than its existing counterpart, these front dormers would differ and yet complement each other. No visual disharmony would therefore result in the general appearance of No 25 or with the general pattern of existing development.
9. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. As such, it does not conflict with Policy D3.D of The London Plan, Policy DM 1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Document or the Council's Supplementary Planning Document *Residential Design Guide*. Together, these policies and guidance promote a high standard of design and aim to ensure that development has regard to local character. The appeal scheme also complies with the policies of the Framework 2024 which, like its predecessor, state that development should be sympathetic to local character and add to the overall quality of the area.
10. The new first floor element of the new rear extension would be set back from the rear boundaries of the site that are shared with the adjacent properties on each side. Given the generous separation distance between the proposed rear extension and neighbouring properties any loss of sunlight or daylight would not be appreciable even if a 45-degree line drawn from the nearest window of an adjacent property is breached.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, a

condition is imposed to require the use of external materials that match those of the existing dwelling, as proposed.

Conclusion

12. There are no material considerations that indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons set out above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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: CD25-02-1001 Revision 1st, CD25-02-1002 Revision 1st, CD25-02-1003 Revision 1st and Aerial 1st, which shows the site edged red.
- 3) 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.