



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2025 by E Nutman

Decision by Chris Forrett BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/24/3358273

21 Newlyn Gardens, Rayners Lane, Harrow HA2 9TA

- 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 Shailesh Koria against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/2390/24.
 - The development proposed is the extension of existing dwellinghouse comprising a two storey side extension, part two storey/part single storey rear extensions and additions to the roof which include a hip-to-gable alteration and the construction of a dormer window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the extension of existing dwellinghouse comprising a two storey side extension, part two storey/part single storey rear extensions and additions to the roof which include a hip-to-gable alteration and the construction of a dormer window at 21 Newlyn Gardens, Harrow, HA2 9TA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2390/24, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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 Plans and Elevations (NWA-24-016-2).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing dwelling.

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.

Procedural Matters

3. The description of development refers to it being part retrospective. However, as 'retrospective' is not an act of development I have removed this from the description of the proposal.
4. From viewing the information before me and what I observed on site, the majority of the external works have been completed on site. However, the development carried

out, whilst largely similar in terms of scale and form, differs slightly from the plans (including minor fenestration differences and the internal layout around the new staircase). Given these differences, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans, which is what was considered by the Council.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the locality with particular regard to the cumulative additions of all of the elements of the proposal.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site is a semi-detached residential property situated at the northern end of Newlyn Gardens. The dwelling is adjoined with 19 Newlyn Gardens and sits adjacent to a railway line. There has been a series of permissions granted individually by the Council for works to the appeal property which includes the majority of the appeal proposal. The most notable differences between what has already been permitted and the current proposal are a narrower two storey side extension and a wider single storey rear extension.
7. Notwithstanding that, the concern of the Council principally relates to the cumulative additions of all the extensions in terms of their combined roof form and bulk, albeit that it is the first-floor rear extension which provides the main concern in respect of how this would affect the appearance of the original property and character of the area.
8. The hip to gable conversion extends off the northern elevation, facing away from the street scene towards the railway line. Furthermore, No. 19 has already undergone a hip to gable roof conversion. Therefore, the development would have a positive impact in this regard as it restores balance and symmetry between the two semi-detached properties when viewed from the street.
9. In respect of the two-storey side extension extending off this gable end, I agree that the hipped roof joined onto the gable end is a little awkward and presents an inconsistent roof form. Nevertheless, the impact of this is mitigated by the slight set back of the side extension at first floor level behind the front elevation wall. In addition to this, the ridge height sits much lower than the main roof plane; thus, it remains subservient to the host property. Therefore, when viewed from within the street scene, I consider its impact to be limited. In coming to that view, I also acknowledge that this aspect of the proposal does not accord with the guidance contained within the Harrow Residential Design Guide (HRDG),
10. Turning to the side and rear aspects of the overall proposal, the single storey element would not harm the overall character or appearance of the host property or the wider area. Similarly, whilst the width of the two-storey rear extension is around 50% of the width of the host dwelling, it does not dominate the host property either in isolation or in combination with the other elements of the overall proposal.
11. However, the same cannot be said in respect of the relationship between the box dormer window and the rear extension which creates a somewhat awkward relationship and is not therefore completely harmonious with the host dwelling.
12. Notwithstanding that, as I observed at my site visit, there are only very limited views of this, with the main views being from passing trains and from the rear aspects of

the surrounding properties. This, combined with the similarities to the extensions already permitted by the Council, leads me to the view that the overall development would not be so harmful as to warrant the withholding of planning permission.

13. The council has also referred to two appeal decisions¹, unrelated to the appeal site. One of these sets out a view that a hipped roof extension adjoined to a converted gable end 'would result in visual inconsistency between the existing and proposed roof form'. The second of these appeals sets out that 'these give an unbalanced appearance which is particularly noticeable on semi-detached houses, such as the appeal property, where the adjoining house retains its original hipped roof'. However, neither of these decisions lead me to a different view on the proposal before me. Moreover, each proposal must be considered on its individual merits.
14. In conclusion, due to the rear extension and rear dormer window having little to no relationship with the street scene, the subordinate nature of the side extension, and the benefits of the re-balancing of the roof form of the pair of semi-detached dwellings, I consider the development acceptable. The cumulative addition of all extensions does not result in unacceptable harm upon the street scene or character of the existing dwelling. It is therefore considered consistent with the objectives of Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021) and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies which amongst other matters seek to achieve a high standard of design and have regard its overall appearance, massing, bulk and scale in relation to its location and surrounding context.

Other Matters

15. I have had regard to comments made in the representations received on the application including matters relating to the planning history to the site and the number of proposals, windows and skylights, privacy and drainage matters. However, none of these matters provide for a compelling reason why planning permission should not be granted for the overall proposal.

Conditions

16. Other than the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the reason of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition relating to matching materials is also necessary.
17. The plans show that there is a window to the front elevation of the side extension. The council indicate that a condition could be imposed to ensure that this is a fixed window rather than a door. However, the plans clearly show that it is a window and as such I consider that it is not considered necessary to attach a condition.

Conclusion and Recommendation

18. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

E Nutman

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

¹ References APP/M5450/D/22/3302969 and APP/M5450/D/23/3314136

Inspector's Decision

19. I have considered all the submitted evidence, and my representative's report, and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR