



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2025 by Sara Manson DipTP

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/24/3357893

1 Flambard Road, Harrow HA1 2NB

- 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 Sinaj against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/2125/24.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension incorporating porch, single and two storey side to rear extension, rear dormer and external alterations (demolition of outbuilding at side).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension incorporating porch, single and two storey side to rear extension, rear dormer and external alterations (demolition of outbuilding at side) at 1 Flambard Road, Harrow HA1 2NB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2125/24, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Ground Floor Plan PL-DR-PR1-00-11, Proposed First Floor Plan PL-DR-PR1-01-12, Proposed Loft Plan PL-DR-PR1-02-13, Proposed Roof Plan PL-DR-PR1-RL-14, Proposed Front & Rear Elevations PL-DR-PR1-XX-60, Proposed LHS & RHS Elevations PL-DR-PR1-XX-61, and Proposed 3D PL-DR-PR1-XX-110.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposed development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal building is an end plot, semi detached dwelling situated in an attractive verdant residential area, characterised by its other semi-detached and detached properties, all set back from a mature tree-lined street with front gardens incorporating off-road parking. Properties are of individual design, and include elements of different materials, double roof pitches, bay windows and front gables. Many appear to have been extended or altered. This contributes positively to a varied street scene. It fronts onto Flambard Road and is side on to the large rear gardens of dwellings off Hawthorne Avenue.
5. Permission is sought for a number of extensions to the property, the majority of which the Council raise no objection too. The main focus for refusal is the proposed two storey side to rear extension, and the resulting configuration of the proposed roof. The outbuilding has been demolished.
6. The Harrow Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (SPD), states that extensions should harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building and the character of the area, retaining the symmetry and rhythm of the original building by reducing the bulk, and avoid terracing. The proposed side extension would improve the symmetry of this pair of semi-detached dwellings. Number 3 (No. 3) benefits from a two storey side extension, which currently unbalances this pair, and as the appeal dwelling is an end plot, the proposals would not create a terracing effect. Nonetheless, the National Planning Policy Framework, which postdates the SPD, states at paragraph 133 that the level of detail and degree of prescription in design guides should be tailored to the circumstances and scale of change and should allow a suitable degree of variety.
7. The altered roof shape would read as a gentle barn hip and has been designed to mirror as close as possible the original hipped roof. There are clearly practical reasons why the approach to the proposed roof design has been taken and the obvious difference in the proposed windowsill height on the front elevation will be off set from the relief provided by the set back. There would be minimal visible changes to the side elevation, when viewed from the junction of Hawthorne Avenue and Flambard Road.
8. My attention has been drawn to two appeal decisions, both referring to extensions involving hip to gable roofs. Both appeal properties are located in more prominent locations, and both had existing extensions that played a major role in the decision-making process. Taken together, the Inspectors considered they would create awkward, incongruous bulky additions. The appeal dwelling is in its original form, and the proposals would mirror to a considerable extent No. 3. Consequently, there is no indication that both appeals were refused for the same reasons that the one before me is being allowed. They were determined on their own merits and context, as has this appeal. These examples do not change my findings.
9. As a result, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area and would not conflict with Policy D3 of The London Plan, Policy DM1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies 2013, and guidance contained in the SPD. The relevant sections of these policies require new development to respond to local distinctiveness, having regard to the massing, bulk, scale and height of the original building.

Other Matters

10. Although the proposed side elevation would extend further towards the rear gardens of Numbers 22 (No. 22) and 24 Hawthorne Avenue, A condition to secure obscure glazing on the eastern (side) elevation, is not required. The proposed window would be to a non-habitable room and be replacing two windows in the existing elevation, neither of which are currently obscure glazed nor non-opening. The garage of No. 22 would also partly obscure views from this window. Concerns relating to proximity to the neighbour's property and construction methods are private and civil and thus beyond the scope of this appeal to resolve.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, I have set out a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plans, as this provides certainty and precision. A condition requiring the use of materials matching that of the existing building is also necessary to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The appeal scheme would comply with the development plan for the reasons I have set out and there is nothing to suggest a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions specified.

Sara Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, and planning permission granted, subject to the conditions set out.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR