



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2026

by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/25/3375797

2 Lake View, Harrow, Edgware HA8 7RU

- 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 & Mrs Joshua Vittori against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/1771/25.
 - The development proposed is Alterations including side gablet and infill between two rear dormers, together with erection of new single storey and two storey rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal site is located within the Canons Park Estate Conservation Area. Consequently I have had special regard to section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (the Act).
3. As part of my assessment, I am aware that planning permission has been allowed at appeal APP/M5450/D/24/3350132 for alterations to hipped roof to provide increased headroom above stair and landing. This permission has not been implemented. The gablet submitted on the drawings before me complies with the permission allowed on appeal, as far as I could tell.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether or not the character and appearance of Canons Park Estate Conservation Area (CA) would be preserved or enhanced.

Reasons

Character and appearance of CA

5. The appeal site is located within the Canons Park Estate CA is residential in character consisting of fine examples of houses consisting of Tudor Revival Metroland architecture. The landscaping and openness and good quality housing enhances the significance of the CA.
6. Number 2 Lake View is an extended semi-detached dwelling positioned amongst other houses that follow similar design characteristics although there is individuality to the design of most. The proposal would extend the dwelling to the rear by squaring off part of the existing single storey rear extension and adding part- two storey extensions together with a side gablet to the existing roof.

7. The front elevation is characterful with the timber framing and white coloured render and peaked roofs forming a distinctive feature. Although there is an imbalance to the pair of semi's, this does not adversely compromise the overall historic interest and value of the pair.
8. As a whole, a large two storey side extension would be created to the rear of the dwelling and visible from the street scene due to the existing layout with the dwelling at No 30 Canons Drive that sits perpendicular to one another allowing views of the side elevation from street level. Currently, even with the single storey extension, the side elevation appears in proportion to the dwelling. By adding to this would significantly extend the dwelling adding significant bulk and mass and therefore appearing out of proportion with the host dwelling.
9. There is some natural landscaping that would partially screen the proposal from street view. However, even if these trees are protected by virtue of the fact they are within a CA, this part of the proposal would not appear subordinate to the host dwelling. Therefore, it would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.

Public benefits

10. Paragraph 213 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that any harm to the significance of the heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. Also, with reference to the Framework and proposals affecting heritage assets, in finding harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, the magnitude of that harm should be assessed. Given the impact of the proposal I find that the harm to be 'less than substantial' in this instance. This harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
11. The benefits of the proposal arising from the extension would be a private benefit for the appellant. There are no public benefits advanced by the appellant.
12. I conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the significance of the conservation area as a whole and as such the proposal would be contrary to the local character, design and heritage protection aims of policies of D3 of the London Plan, Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy, Policy DM1 of the Development Management Plan Local Policies and the Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guide.

Other Matters

13. The proposal raises no effects regarding living conditions of adjacent occupants. This is however a neutral matter and neither weighs for or against the proposal.
14. The appellant raises contradiction with the Council's approach to the proposal. This is a matter between the parties and not within my scope to comment.

Conclusion

15. Therefore, the proposed development would lead to conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR