



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 March 2025

by **C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/24/3354361

17 Sandymount Avenue, Stanmore, Harrow HA7 4UA

- 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 Vuksani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/1919/24.
 - The development proposed is construction of two-storey (2-bed dwelling); parking; landscaping; bin and cycle stores.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area;
 - whether the site is a suitable location for housing having regard to the development strategy for the area; and
 - whether the proposal makes adequate provision for the safe access and operation of Sandymount Avenue with regards to vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a triangular shaped garden associated with a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. There is currently a single storey detached garage on the site, accessed via a driveway. A fence the same height as the garage runs across the site to the side of the existing dwelling. The existing dwelling and adjoining dwelling are turned at an angle to the rest of the street as they are located on a corner plot.
4. The surrounding area is characterised by semi-detached dwellings of a similar style, with off road parking or gardens to the front and rear gardens. The majority of the dwellings retain their original hipped roofs, although there are some examples where this has been altered to create pitched roofs. Although there have been some single storey side extensions the gaps between dwellings are generally retained. The building proportions, building lines, rooflines and gaps between the

dwelling provides a regularity to the pattern of the street scene. The regularity of this arrangement has a pleasing rhythm that contributes positively to the street's pattern of development.

5. The Harrow Garden Land Development Planning Supplementary Planning Document (2013) (SPD) provides guidance on the approach for new development on garden land. The SPD does not make any distinction between front, side and rear gardens. The SPD states that an exception will be made for 'gap sites' within a built street frontage, which are defined as obvious vacant plots. However, in the case of the appeal site, the gap between dwellings is clearly part of the planned layout of the street as it is a repeated pattern and therefore does not comprise a gap site.
6. The proposed dwelling would be detached with a hipped roof, would be a similar height to the adjoining properties and would follow broadly the same building line. However, it would have a much smaller footprint in comparison to the wider built form of the pairs of semi-detached dwellings, which would disrupt the regular pattern of the street scene. Furthermore, the built form of the dwelling would be located right up to the boundaries with the adjoining property at No 19 and the existing dwelling at No 17, which would be at odds with the spacious, uniform pattern of development. Therefore, the scale of the dwelling in comparison with the size of the plot and the existing pattern of development would harm the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.
7. Although the garden is partially enclosed by the existing fence, the orientation of the dwellings means that there is a gap, between them which offers views towards the taller landscaping of rear gardens, which contributes to the open appearance of the street. The proposal would enclose this gap which would further erode the spacious pattern of the street scene.
8. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. It thereby conflicts with Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) (LDNP) and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies (2013) (DMP). Together, these policies amongst other things seek to ensure that new development enhances local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape and achieve a high standard of design and layout.

Spatial approach

9. Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) (CS) states that growth will be managed in accordance with the spatial strategy which directs new residential development to the Harrow and Wealdstone Intensification Area, District and Local Centres and Strategic Brownfield Suburban Sites and Regeneration Areas. Criteria B also states that proposals that would harm the character of suburban areas and garden development will be resisted.
10. The proposed development would be located within the garden of an existing dwelling and is not within a location to which the spatial strategy directs new residential development. Moreover, I have found that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal site is not in a suitable location for new housing having regard to the development strategy for the area. The proposal thereby conflicts with Policies CS1.A and CS1.B of the CS, which seek amongst

other things to manage growth in accordance with the spatial strategy and resist garden development.

Vehicle movement

11. The existing dwelling is set at an angle to the rest of the street as it turns the corner. The street rounds the corner at a right angle and then rises gradually upwards. The dropped kerb providing access to the existing garage is located close to this corner and permit parking spaces are located on the road.
12. The proposed new dwelling is shown on the submitted plans as utilising the existing crossover. However, the plans also show that a new crossway would be created to provide vehicle access to the existing dwelling, which would be closer to the bend in the road. No information has been submitted in relation to visibility splays for this new access. Therefore, based on the submitted evidence I am not satisfied that the proposal would not harm traffic flow or the safety of pedestrians and other users.
13. Consequently, the proposal does not make adequate provision for the safe access and operation of Sandymount Avenue with regards to vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. It thereby conflicts with Policy T6 of the LNDP and Policies DM1 and DM44 of the DMP, which seek amongst other things to ensure that proposals which would be detrimental to safety and traffic flow will be resisted.

Conclusion

14. The proposal would provide an additional family dwelling designed to minimise environmental impact, optimise energy efficiency and utilise space occupied by an existing garage. However, I have found that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area, is not in a suitable location in accordance with the spatial strategy and fails to provide adequate provision for safe access. These harms are not outweighed by the benefits I have identified and therefore, material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with the development plan.
15. Accordingly, for the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Skelly

INSPECTOR