



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2025 by M Long BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10TH June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/25/3358422

98A Merrion Avenue, Stanmore, Harrow HA7 4RU

- 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 Gaurav Sharma against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/2166/24.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing rear/side extensions, new single storey rear extension, double storey side extension and front porch, changes to fenestration, redesign of roof and addition of 3x rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing rear/side extensions, new single storey rear extension, double storey side extension and front porch, changes to fenestration, redesign of roof and addition of 3x rooflights at 98A Merrion Avenue, Stanmore, Harrow HA7 4RU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: PL/2166/24, 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 approved plans: MA-003 (Proposed Floor Plans), MA-004 (Proposed Elevations) and the Location Plan (dated 6 August 2024).
 - 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. Within the officer's report, conflict is cited with Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) (CS), however this is not mentioned in the reason for refusal in the decision notice. In the interests of completeness, I have had regard to this Policy as part of my considerations.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. In the vicinity of the site, Merrion Avenue is largely characterised by semi-detached pairs that mainly have hipped roof forms and similar fenestration patterns which more often include main entrance doors to their front elevations. Occasionally, dwellings have single storey front projecting elements.
6. The appeal dwelling occupies a corner plot at the junction with Charlbury Avenue and has a single storey projection abutting the boundary with this road. In contrast to many of the surrounding houses, it is detached, has a gabled roof and its main entrance is to the side. 98B Merrion Avenue (No 98B), on the opposite corner, is also detached but has a hipped roof with a hipped forward projection on its front elevation. It also has a single storey side projection close to its side boundary. The footpath is flanked by grass verges in the vicinity of these opposing corner properties. This ensures that, despite built form extending close to the boundary on both corners, there remains a suitable spaciousness to the street at this point.
7. While the proposal would significantly alter the overall form of the appeal dwelling, the resultant design responds appropriately to the existing characteristics and architecture of the surrounding houses. The proposed hipped roof, for instance, would be in keeping with the predominant roof form in the locality and would help to integrate the two-storey side extension. The ridgeline would match the height of the ridge at the neighbouring semi-detached pair on Merrion Avenue. Also, the single storey side projection would broadly reflect the side projection on the opposing corner dwelling at No 98B, retaining a suitable spaciousness to the corner in this particular instance. The single storey front element would have a cohesive appearance as part of the overall design, incorporating a main entrance to the front elevation in line with most of the surrounding houses.
8. Consequently, and even taking into account its prominent corner plot location, the design of the extended appeal dwelling would respond to the local character of housing and would acceptably assimilate into the wider street scene.
9. I conclude that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would accord with Policy DM 1 (Achieving a High Standard of Development) of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies (2013) which requires that all development must achieve a high standard of design and layout. It would also accord with Core Policy CS 1 (Overarching Policy) of the CS and Policy D3 (Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach) of The London Plan (2021) which, amongst other things, require development that responds positively to the local context and existing character of a place.
10. For the same reasons, the proposal would comply with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure developments are sympathetic to local character. The proposal would also broadly respond to the design guidance in the Harrow Council Residential Design Guide: Supplementary Planning Document (2010) insofar as it would harmonise with the character of the area.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time period for commencement, I recommend a condition to require that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, which is necessary for certainty. I also recommend a condition to ensure that the external materials of the development match those on the host dwelling to protect the character and appearance of the area.
12. The Council has suggested a condition to restrict the use of the roof area of the ground floor rear extension as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area. I do not consider that the flat roof to this part of the development would be easily accessible to occupiers and the provision of a balcony would require separate planning permission. Therefore, such a condition is not necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

M Long

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

M Russell

INSPECTOR