



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2025 by Mr F Bradford BA (Hons)

Decision by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/25/3367450

86 Kingshill Avenue, Harrow, HA3 8LB

- 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 Don Purohit against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/0309/25.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor front extension and a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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 proposed development's effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises of a two storey, semi-detached dwelling which has undergone alteration by way of a part two, part single storey side extension and is located on a corner plot between Kingshill Avenue and Boxmoor Road. The area of Kingshill Avenue immediately around the site is characterised by semi-detached dwellings, some of which have undergone alteration and extension over time though nevertheless maintain a general sense of legible uniformity in terms of their scale and bulk.
5. The proposed development introduces an additional storey to the existing single-storey side extension (the proposed development). Whilst the proposed development may be limited in scale, it would occupy a highly prominent location and, due to its irregular shape and lowered roof ridge, would relate poorly to the existing dwelling, appearing as an incongruous additional structure.
6. Although the property has already been extended to the side, the original scale remains legible, aided by the setback of the existing extension. A further addition to the side, even if set back, would undermine this legibility, and instead contribute to an overall bulk that would significantly alter the scale of the original dwelling. As a

result, the proposed development would cause the host property to appear substantially larger than neighbouring dwellings on Kingshill Avenue.

7. By virtue of its incongruity and overall bulk, the proposed development would degrade the contribution of the dwelling to the uniformity of Kingshill Avenue. For these reasons, I find harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene and therefore conflict with the Harrow development plan with particular regard to policies CS1.B (Local Character) of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), and DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013), which among other things, aims to ensure high quality design and that development responds positively to the local context in terms of its design, reinforces the positive attributes of local distinctiveness and if an extension, respects its host dwelling.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has noted developments of similar merit in support of this appeal. However, I do not find that these developments present a comparative basis of merit to that proposed.
9. The extension at No.88 Kingshill Avenue is single storey and whilst its roof ridge is of a similar height to the first-floor window, this does not replicate the two storey bulk that would be introduced nor its subsequent effects. Similarly, the alterations to No. 70 Kingshill Avenue do not include a side extension, and as such its effects also do not replicate that of the proposed development as described.
10. Whilst the extension at 50B Kenton Park Road is similar in terms of its design, I do not know the circumstances of this case or the policies that applied at the time of its consideration. In any event, the development confirms that such alterations and extensions serve to undermine the uniformity of dwellings and contribution of corner plots, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
11. The developments located at 5 Kenton Park Road, 6 Kenton Park Close, and 96 & 102 Kingshill Avenue are not sited on corner plots and therefore are contextually different in their effects than that of the appeal site.
12. I recognise the appellant's willingness to make amendments to the scheme via a condition. However, this would result in a material change to the proposal and would not be what was before the council at the time when it made its decision and as such would be procedurally unfair.

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 dismissed.

Finlay Bradford

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 dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR