



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2025

by K Townend BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/24/3348179

1027 Harrow Road, Harrow HA0 2SJ

- 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 Vimal Mishra against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/1045/24.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension (demolition of garage).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Government has recently published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been substantially amended. As a result, I have not sought submissions on the revised Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by taking this approach.
3. I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision letter and the appellant's appeal form as this more accurately describes the appeal proposal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling which has previously been extended through a hip to gable roof extension, a rear dormer with Juliette balcony and rooflights and a single-storey rear extension. These works had been completed at the time of my visit.
6. The property lies within a row of semi-detached houses. There is variety in the detailing of the houses, however, there is also a consistency in that they are mostly semi-detached, of a similar size, predominately hipped roofed and of a similar age. This forms a character area of houses along this side of Harrow Road. On the opposite side of the road, and near the junction with Sudbury Court Drive are blocks of flats and there are other house types and designs in the wider area. Nevertheless, the road forms a visual break between the houses and the flats.
7. The proposal is for a two-storey side extension. Although the existing garage is not set back the proposal seeks to demolish the garage and construct a new, two-

storey, extension which would not be set back from the front wall at either the ground or first floor level. It would, therefore, not comply with the advice at 6.46 of the Harrow Council Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guide, adopted 15 December 2010 (the SPD).

8. Even though it would be narrower than the front of the host dwelling and with matching fenestration, the proposed extension would not form a subservient addition to the dwelling. Moreover, the ridge and eaves height of the proposed extension are not sufficiently lower than the existing dwelling to be clearly read as a subordinate pitched roof, as required by paragraph 6.46 of the SPD.
9. Paragraph 6.57 of the SPD also advises that where a property has already been extended by the conversion of a hipped roof to a gable roof that further side extensions would be inappropriate. The existing dwelling, following the hip to gable extension, is already out of keeping with the street scene of hipped roofed houses. The proposed extension, albeit repeating the new gable roof form and although of materials to match the existing house, would infill the whole of the space to the side of the dwelling, and nearly at full two-storey height. It would, therefore, appear contrived and add to the visual imbalance to a significant degree.
10. The extension would be prominent in the street scene due to the position of the neighbouring property and the curvature of the road. Due to its scale and lack of subservience it would draw attention to the host dwelling. The extension would, as a bulky, dominant, extension to the side of the dwelling, be an incongruous addition. It would, therefore, harmfully alter the appreciation of the street scene of the houses along this side of Harrow Road, contrary to the advice at 6.37 and 6.48 of the SPD which seeks to ensure that side extensions reflect the pattern of development in the street scene.
11. Other extensions to the houses along this road have either been hip to gable alterations or side extensions that are set back and down so as to respect the form and character of the host dwelling. I have not been provided with any compelling evidence of extensions similar to that proposed in the appeal scheme.
12. For the above reasons, the proposed extension would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area. It would, therefore, fail to comply with Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy, February 2012 (the CS), subsection B, which seeks to ensure that all development responds positively to the local context, seeks to resist development that would harm the character of suburban areas and requires extensions to respect the host building.
13. For the same reasons, the proposal would not comply with Policy DM1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies, July 2013 (the DMP) which seeks to ensure that all development achieves a high standard of design and layout and resists development that is detrimental to local character and appearance. Policy DM1(B) requires development to have regard to the massing, bulk, scale, and height in relation to the location and surroundings and also to have regard to the appearance of the building, including, but not limited to roof form, and the local character and pattern of development.
14. It would also be contrary to Policy D3 of The London Plan, March 2021 (the LonP) which seeks to ensure that all development is design-led and responds to local distinctiveness and the character of a place through, amongst other matters, appearance, shape, form, and proportions.

Other Matters

15. The appellant has advised that the extension would allow them to achieve improved and enlarged family accommodation to suit their family's needs. However, the preferences of the property owner for additional bedrooms and a reception room would not outweigh the harm identified above.
16. That there have been no third party objections, and that the host dwelling is neither a Listed Building nor within a Conservation Area, would also not alter my decision on the main issue.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

K Townsend

INSPECTOR