



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2025

by **T Bennett BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/24/3349416

30 Chester Drive, North Harrow, Harrow HA2 7PU

- 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 Rachana Patil against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/0535/24.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension 3m deep, garage conversion with first floor extension above, re-design of front entrance, loft conversion with rear dormer, rendered external wall insulation to existing external walls.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. The Council's reason for refusal is focused on the side extension. I have considered the other elements of the proposed development, for which the Council raised no issues. From the information before me, I see no reason to disagree.
3. The main issue is therefore the effect of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the host property and street scene.

Reasons

4. 30 Chester Drive is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling with a garage adjoining the property adjacent to the boundary with No 28. The adjoining property at No 32 has a two storey side extension that extends to its boundary with No 34.
5. Properties along Chester Drive are primarily post war semi-detached dwellings. Several have undergone a mix of single and two storey side extensions. Whilst these vary in style and form, they predominantly contain setbacks on the side or front elevation and with rooflines set down from the main ridge. This makes them appear as subordinate additions to the host dwelling and when viewed against neighbouring properties.
6. In this case, the proposed design seeks to mirror the adjoining property at No 32. The extension at No 32 does not feature set backs on the side and front elevation, nor is its roofline set down from the main ridge. It thus appears as a dominant addition. The Council explain that this extension dates from 1986, as such it predates current National and Local planning policy.
7. The proposed first-floor side extension would increase the width of the front elevation up to the boundary of the neighbouring property at No 28. With the same

ridge height as the host property and no first-floor recess from either the front or side elevation, the extension would elongate the frontage and it would not appear as a subordinate addition to the host dwelling, harmfully at odds with the prevailing form of extensions seen on surrounding properties.

8. I note that the Council consider the proposed extension would detrimentally enclose the gap between the host property and No 28, resulting in an unacceptable terracing effect. I have had regard to the presence of existing side extensions on surrounding properties. I observed several without a first-floor setback on the side elevation, including at Nos 20 and 54 Chester Drive. Because of this and the variety of side extensions, the spacious gaps that may have once existed have been gradually eroded. As such, I do not find the gaps between dwellings a significant feature of Chester Drive and find that a reduced gap between No 30 and No 28 in itself would not be harmful or inconsistent with the character of the streetscene.
9. Notwithstanding this, the extensions at Nos 20 and 54 both feature a lower roof ridge and have a set-back on the front elevation. There are therefore not directly comparable in scale to the scheme before me. Given the scale of the proposed extension, when viewed in combination with No 32, it would result in a building of significantly larger mass and bulk, which would be in sharp contrast to other paired dwellings in the street. Overall, it would appear as a dominant feature within the street scene, unduly drawing the eye.
10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal scheme would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021). This amongst other matters, requires proposals to enhance and respond positively to the local context and character. It would also conflict with Policy CS1.B of The Harrow Core Strategy (2012) which has similar aims. There would also be conflict with Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013). This seeks proposals that achieve a high standard of design having regard to the massing, bulk and scale of the proposals in relation to the surroundings.

Other Matters

11. I note that the host property is not a listed building, is not in a conservation area and that the extension would utilise matching materials and would create a degree of visual balance with the neighbouring property. However, these factors do not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

T Bennett

INSPECTOR