



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 August 2025

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/25/3366423

39 Kingsfield Avenue, North Harrow, Harrow, HA2 6AQ

- 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 Wayne Mertins-Brown against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/0088/25.
 - The development proposed is the erection of part single part double-storey wrap around extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling within a residential suburb comprising properties of broadly similar age and type. No 39 has previously been extended with a hip-to-gable roof alteration, a large, box-dormer to the rear roof slope, and a single-storey rear extension across the full width of the dwelling. The proposal would replace a single-storey lean-to garage to the side with a recessed, two-storey extension which would project rearwards with a subservient gable and would incorporate a single-storey lean-to roof to the front, which would wrap around the dwelling's front elevation to incorporate a new porch.
4. The Council's *Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD) was adopted in 2010. Its section 6 deals with guidance for householder development and advises generally that extensions should harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building and character of the area, that their volume should be subordinate to, and reflective of the character of the original house, and that they should have a sense of proportion and balance in their own right. With specific regard to two-storey side extensions, it advises that a hipped roof is preferable but that exceptions may be made dependent upon site considerations although it does further advise that where a property has previously been extended by the conversion of a hipped to a gabled roof, a further side extension would be inappropriate as such developments are considered incompatible with the design, character, bulk and appearance of the locality.

5. During my visit, I observed many properties along Kingsfield Avenue had been extended in a variety of ways that were evident within the street scene. Some had been extended to the side as a simple continuation of the dwelling's original two-storey form. Others had recessed, two-storey side extensions with hipped roofs reflecting the original roof form of the dwelling, whilst a few had simple hip-to-gable changes. My attention has been drawn specifically to No 49, which displays a hip-to-gable change, and a side, two-storey recessed extension with a hipped roof. When all are considered, the changes along Kingsfield Avenue are mixed and plentiful, but of key significance is that most two-storey side additions had been undertaken to either directly reflect the form of the original dwelling, or else to appear subservient to it.
6. The proposed side extension at No 39 would reflect the altered gabled form of the dwelling. As an extension to a property which has already had a hip-to-gable change, the proposal would conflict with the SPD's guidance. However, by reason of its recessed position at first-floor, and its nominal width, it would appear appropriately subservient and proportionate to the scale of the existing dwelling. In addition, it would be set away from the boundary with the unattached neighbour at No 37, such that it would not appear cramped in relation to it, or awkwardly juxtaposed. Given that gable ends feature within the area, including already at No 39, along with a plethora of two-storey side additions, I am unable to discern in this instance any impact within the street scene that would be particularly harmful. Along with the front porch, which the Council finds acceptable, I am satisfied that the side extension, when seen from Kingsfield Avenue, would appear successfully assimilated into the street scene.
7. To the rear, due to the existing dormer window, the original rear roof slope of the dwelling has been lost in favour of an extension that reads more as a full second storey rather than a sub-ordinate feature. The proposed gabled projection at first-floor level to the side and rear would be a further piecemeal addition. It would contribute to an accumulation of change that would combine to create a cluttered and confused roofscape with little cohesion or respect for the architectural composition of the original dwelling or the wider character and appearance of the area. Whilst the rear of the property would not be seen from the public domain along Kingsfield Avenue, the development would not be out of sight but would be open to view from the rear gardens of nearby properties where it would appear visually incongruous and out of keeping.
8. I am aware that some other two-storey rear extensions exist locally, including those I was able to see from the rear garden of the appeal property. However, from those I observed, the rear element appeared as an appropriately integrated part of the dwelling's roof form. The examples I am aware of are not comparable with the appeal proposal.
9. Although I am not persuaded that the side extension would be harmful to the street scene, I find overall that the proposal would fail to harmonise with the character of No 39 or the wider area. In this regard it would fail to meet the objectives of the SPD. As such, there would be conflict with Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021), Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), and Policy DM1 of the Council's Development Management Policies (2013). Between them, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure that new development achieves a high standard of design that responds positively to local distinctiveness.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR