



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2020

by Mr W Johnson BA(Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/20/3246398

242 Cannon Lane, Pinner, Middlesex HA5 1JD

- 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 Sunil Arora against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/4108/19, dated 18 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Conversion of single dwelling into two dwellings (1 x 2no. Bed and 1 x 3no. Bed). Two storey and first floor rear extension to roof, conversion of garage and store to habitable rooms with installation of window and door to the front, parking, bin storage and external alterations'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Despite numerous attempts to obtain the full consultee¹ responses to the planning application from the Council, they have not been provided. In this instance I have examined the consultee comments contained in the Officer Report. I will not prejudice any party in taking this approach and have therefore dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Background and Main Issue

3. The Council do not cite any objections to the proposed development in relation to the principle of development, living conditions or highway safety. On the basis of the evidence before me, I have little reason to disagree with the Council's observations.
4. Therefore, the main area of disagreement from the reason for refusal on this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area, with particular regard to the proposed roof.

Reasons

5. The host dwelling is a semi-detached house in a residential location that is set back from the road. The site forms an end property on this side of Cannon Lane before the Durley Avenue junction and benefits from a larger plot, when compared to its neighbours. Additionally, due to the presence of Durley Avenue and a grassed area of public realm with a mature tree between the site and

¹ Highways and The Pinner Association.

Durley Avenue, the site has a prominent location in the street scene. This is accentuated through Durley Avenue returning along the rear of the site.

6. The host dwelling currently has a hipped roof over the main house and a notable 2-storey side extension with a flat roof. The 2-storey side extension does not currently extend to the full depth of the host dwelling but does project beyond the adjoining wall of the original property. The proposal seeks to extend the footprint of the existing side extension to the rear building line of the host dwelling formed by the single storey lean to.
7. Whilst noting the misgivings in the appearance of the existing flat roof 2-storey extension, I find that the proposed development would create an overly wide gable end and a dominant structure that would be clearly visible from both Cannon Road and Durley Avenue. I acknowledge that the ridgeline of the proposed development would be the same as the host dwelling and the 'in principle' visual benefits that could arise from the addition of a pitched roof to the property. However, this does not provide sufficient mitigation to outweigh the visual harm created by the proposed development.
8. I find the design approach in this instance to form an awkward feature between the pitched roof and the flat roof projections to both the front and rear of the proposed development, especially on the proposed gable end. Additionally, an excessive amount of bulk and massing would result on the visually prominent side elevation. Whilst the front projection is already present on the existing side extension, I am far from convinced that the proposed development would not result in a harmful effect to the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area.
9. For all of these reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area. This would be contrary to the design, character and appearance aims of Policies 7.4B, 7.6B of the London Plan 2016, Policy CS 1B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013 and guidance contained within the Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide 2010. The proposal would also be contrary to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. I have noted the comments from the appellant about the way the Council handled the application, but this does not affect the planning merits of the case. I have considered this appeal on its own merits and concluded that the proposed development would be unacceptable for the reasons set out above.
11. During my site visit I noted a tree and street lamp on the grass verge in front of the host dwelling. These features would be in proximity of the access to the proposed new car parking space for the existing house. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, I have not needed to consider this matter further.

Conclusion

12. Whilst I accept the absence of other harm arising from the scheme and the social and economic benefits that would occur from the provision of an

additional dwelling, these factors, for the reasons described, do not outweigh my assessment of the main issue.

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

W Johnson

INSPECTOR