



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2025 by E Clifford BA (Hons), MA

Decision by Chris Forrett BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/25/3359141

3 Twyford Road, Harrow, HA2 0SH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Yusaf Ibrahim against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application ref is PL/2489/24.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of garage to habitable room; single and two storey rear extension; first floor side extension; refuse and cycle storage; external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. As noted from the appeal documentation and what I observed on site, some of the proposed works have already been undertaken. Notwithstanding that, I have determined this appeal on the basis of the submitted drawings.

Appeal Procedure

3. 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

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the host dwelling and the wider character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. Twyford Road has a suburban, residential character and is characterised by the 1930s style of housing that is also seen in the surrounding area. This gives the area and the road a sense of uniformity, although a number of the neighbouring properties have undergone a degree of alteration, including single and two-storey extensions and some hip-to-gable roof changes. The houses are set back from the road and are bound by mostly paved driveways and low brick walls and the presence of maturing trees gives a spacious and verdant character. The appeal site itself is one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings at the corner of Welbeck Road which has been altered by means of a hip-to-gable roof extension together with a large box dormer window to the rear.

6. The proposal would add a two-storey side and rear extension which would wrap around the existing dwelling. Whilst the proposal would not accord with the guidance contained within the Harrow Residential Design Guide (HRDG), I am also conscious that there are examples of similar hipped roof side extensions extending from a hip-to-gable conversion. To that end, I consider that the principal of such an extension would not give rise to a significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property or the wider area.
7. However, the wrap around nature of the first-floor element of the extension would result in the dwelling having a domineering and top-heavy appearance which would only be exacerbated by the presence of the existing large rear dormer. The combination of the existing dormer with the proposed extension would further unbalance the semi-detached pair, causing harm to the character of both the host dwelling and the wider area.
8. Furthermore, the interaction of the new roofline and the existing rear dormer would create an awkward union and create a bulky and overly dominant massing in a prominent location. Whilst rear dormers and gable ends are both a feature in the surrounding street scene, it is the combined massing of the overall proposed development which would result in a visually obtrusive feature in the landscape which would be visible from public vantage points on Welbeck Road as well as the rear gardens of surrounding properties.
9. I have also had regard to the overall width of the first-floor element at the rear and that of the single storey rear extension which covers almost the entire width of the site. Whilst I consider that these aspects of the proposal are not a determinative harmful factor when considered in isolation, when all of the other extensions are considered, these aspects only add weight to the overall unacceptable massing of the development when taken as a whole.
10. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area and would be conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy DM1 of Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013, which amongst other matters seeks to ensure that all development proposals achieve a high standard of design and layout and to preserve the local character and appearance. and Policy GR1 of the Harrow Emerging Local Plan (2021-2041).

Other Matters

11. I have also had regard to the accommodation needs of the occupier, the economic benefits of the scheme in creating local employment, the potential for an increase in council tax, and the lack of public opposition to the proposal. However, none of these considerations outweigh the harm that I have found.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

E Clifford

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 dismissed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR