
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2020

by C Osgathorp BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/20/3256670

29 Durley Avenue, Pinner HA5 1JJ

- 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 Nishat Suri and Touseer Ahmad against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/0890/20, dated 7 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'single storey (part) rear extension and proposed side extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Durley Avenue consists of semi-detached and terraced dwellings, which are sited in a regular street pattern. The original buildings are designed with symmetrical features and proportions, including hipped roofs and front bay windows. Some properties have had hip to gable extensions to the main roof. Whilst the street scene includes side extensions and garages, the dwellings are generally set in from the side boundaries at upper floor level. This provides spacing between the buildings which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the street scene.
4. The main roof of the appeal property has previously been extended by way of a hip to gable roof extension. The proposed first floor side extension would also have a gabled roof. In combination with the existing roof extension, the proposal would add significant bulk which would not respect the scale and proportions of the original dwelling. Whilst it would be set back from the front elevation and set down from the ridgeline of the main roof, the proposed extension would fill the space between the upper floor of the dwelling and the side boundary with No 31. This would create a cramped appearance and exacerbate the dominance of the extension in the street scene.
5. I appreciate that the street scene includes some properties with 2 storey side extensions. However, the main roofs and extensions of those properties are generally hipped, and so they are less bulky and provide more spacing.

Consequently, those examples are not directly comparable to the appeal scheme.

6. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies 7.4.B and 7.6.B of the London Plan 2016, Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies 2013 and guidance in the Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide 2010, which, amongst other things, state that proposals which fail to achieve a high standard of design and layout, or which are detrimental to local character and appearance, will be resisted.
7. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Osgathorp

INSPECTOR