



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2020

by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/20/3246223

63 Greystoke Avenue, Pinner, London HA5 5SN

- 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 S Sabharwal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/4686/19, dated 30 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 January 2020.
 - The development is described on the application form as a three-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council have described the proposal as a 'Two storey side extension with habitable roofspace; single storey rear extension; rear dormer; rooflights in front and side roofspaces (demolition of side extension)'. I note that the Appellant has also utilised this description on their appeal form and I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of this revised description.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on the south-eastern corner of Greystoke Avenue and Ainsdale Crescent which is a residential area consisting of largely two storey (in scale) semi-detached properties. Given the corner location of the appeal dwelling, the side of the property is highly visible in the streetscene. Additionally, the upper parts of the rear elevation are also highly visible from Ainsdale Crescent given the angle of the road to the house itself.
5. The appeal proposal is for a two-storey side extension which also includes accommodation in the roofspace. The proposal also details a box dormer window on the rear roofslope of the existing dwelling and a single storey rear extension, both of which I understand have already been granted planning permission¹ by the Council.

¹ References P/3334/18 and P/3548/18.

6. To my mind, the main consideration in this appeal therefore relates to the two-storey side extension element of the proposal. This extension would be located on the exposed side of the dwelling to Ainsdale Crescent. Whilst it would inevitably increase the bulk and size of the existing dwelling, given the amount of land available at the side of the property I consider that it would not, in principle, result in an unacceptably bulky dwelling. The proposed wall and fenestration would largely reflect the existing dwelling and would therefore be consistent with its character. Therefore, the key aspect as to the acceptability of the proposal turns on the whether the overall roof design would be appropriate.
7. The main roof of the existing dwelling has a gable end, whereas the proposed side extension would have a hipped roof. From the submitted plans, the join between the two roof styles would not relate well to one another, particularly when viewed from the property frontage.
8. In addition to the above, the relationship between the hipped roof and the box dormer would appear clumsy and disjointed. Given the exposed nature of the rear elevation from Ainsdale Crescent, this would be particularly prominent in the streetscene. Taking these factors into account, the design and visual appearance of the resultant roof would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area as a whole.
9. Whilst I acknowledge that the proposal would deliver a significantly improved standard of internal accommodation, this does not justify a development which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
10. For the above reasons the development would harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policy 7.4 (B) of The London Plan (2016), Policy CS 1 (B) of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and Policy DM 1 (B) of the Harrow Development Management Policies Document (2013) which amongst other matters seek to ensure that proposals do not harm the character of suburban areas and that extensions respect their host building and respond positively to the local design.

Conclusion

11. Taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR