
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 December 2020

by M Shrigley BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/20/3260300
Suncourt, Mayfield Drive, Pinner HA5 5QT

- 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 Dr Chetan Kaher against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/0188/20, dated 16 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a two storey front extension/infill rear extension and raising of first floor side roof
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appellant's appeal statement refers to a more detailed description of the development shown on the appeal drawings. But I have used the description specified on the planning application form as this has been subject to local consultation.
3. I note that the Draft London Plan (2019) is at intend to publish stage following an examination in public. Therefore, I acknowledge it carries significant weight.
4. There is a discrepancy in the appeal plans in that they do not show the existing chimneys on both sides of the dwelling.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the extensions on the character and appearance of the area including regard to the setting of the Tookes Green Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

6. The appeal dwelling is a large detached property situated within a cul de sac. The dwelling has a front gable projection on one side and attractive architectural features including two small chimney stacks within its roof. It lies outside of, but adjacent to, the boundary of the Tookes Green CA. The dwelling occupies an elevated position to properties within the CA boundary. The character of the immediate area features attractive properties of varying designs including several bungalows.

7. The introduction of twin gables on the front elevation of the appeal dwelling, front dormer, as well as a two-storey side extension would increase its overall size, bulk and dominance relative to other dwellings within the immediate street scene. A good number of these are single storey and modest in scale, including properties directly opposite and adjacent to the appeal dwelling. As a result, the increase in size and dominance would be noticeable and visually harmful.
8. Attractive original first floor brickwork detailing on the sides of the appeal dwelling would be covered over with rendering which would detract from its distinctive features. The plans also show the removal of the existing small chimney stacks within the main roof and a new chimney on the side gable of the dwelling closest to the CA boundary which would be tall and visually imposing.
9. I have not been provided with specific information about the CA other than the appellant's heritage statement and a plan detailing the boundary. However, I could see at my site visit that it contains a variety of fine houses with attractive decorative period features.
10. The most important aspects of the CA setting relevant to the appeal are the public vistas available along Mayfield Drive, part of which is within the CA. I note that the Council's Conservation Officer takes the view that the proposal would preserve the setting of the CA. But given the appeal property has an elevated relationship to its boundary this would exacerbate the visual dominance of the chimney and the other changes to the front elevation within the street scene. I find that the changes would be overly dominant and discordant with the design and appearance of nearby housing within the CA. As a result, the proposal would be harmful to its setting.
11. The single storey extension and small dormers on the rear elevation also shown on the appeal plans are secluded from view. They would not have a significant impact on the character of the area or setting of the CA. But that does not take away from the other harm I have identified.
12. I conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of the area including the setting of the Tookes Green CA which the property is adjacent to. The development would be contrary to the following policies CS1B of the Core Strategy which states that proposals which harm local character will be resisted; Policies 7.4B, 7.6B 7.8B and 7.8D of the London Plan (2016) which in combination encourage high quality design and the protection of the setting of heritage assets; Policies D1 and D4 of the Draft London Plan (2019) which encourage understanding an areas character for decision making and good design delivery; as well as Policies DM1 and DM7 of the Harrow Development Management Policies (2013) which seek to encourage a high standard of design and the preservation of the setting of heritage assets.

Other Matters

13. I appreciate the appellant has undertaken negotiations with the Council prior to making a planning application and there is officer support for the scheme evidenced. But those negotiations are not binding. I have determined the appeal on the evidence before me and found there to be substantive harm.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal does not succeed.

M Shrigley

INSPECTOR