



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 April 2021

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/20/3262037

58 Central Avenue, Pinner, HA5 5BP

- 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 Chris Sanders and Mrs Jenny Sanders against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/2986/20, dated 24 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is a front extension to form a new porch, double side and part rear extension single rear storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposed development is taken from the application form. The decision notice describes the proposed development as "Single storey front extension incorporating front porch; single and two storey side extension; single storey rear extension; front dormer; rooflight in front roofslope; three sun tubes in roof (demolition of side extension and conservatory)."

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and its effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 60 Central Avenue, with regards to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two storey extended semi-detached dwelling located within a residential area.
 5. No 58 Central Avenue is situated in a prominent location towards Clifton Avenue's junction with Hillcroft Avenue and is separated from dwellings fronting Hillcroft Avenue by rear gardens and the presence of two small single storey garages fronting Central Avenue.
 6. Central Avenue in this location is characterised by the presence of two storey semi-detached dwellings set back from the road behind gardens and/or parking
-

areas, with long gardens to the rear. The presence of street trees and occasional grass verges contributes to the area's sense of greenery and spaciousness.

7. During my site visit I observed there to be a distinctive and attractive sense of uniformity and prevailing rhythm to the appearance of dwellings in this part of Central Avenue. Dwellings have a similar semi-detached chalet style with distinctive cat slide roofs. This results in a striking, distinctive and attractive sense of uniformity extending from the appeal property, No 58, up to and including No 68 Central Avenue.
8. Whilst I also noted during my site visit that many properties have been altered and/or extended, such changes generally appear subservient to host properties and in keeping with the character of the area.
9. The proposed development would introduce a new dormer feature to the front elevation, the prominence, scale and appearance of which would severely interrupt the positive contribution made by the cat slide roof to the uniform qualities of the area.
10. In addition, the proposed two storey side extension would result in the creation of a hipped roof, which would appear in contrast to and out of keeping with, the host property's gabled roof.
11. The harm arising in the above regard would be exacerbated as a result of the prominent location of the appeal property, such that the introduction of the front gable and the hipped roof would appear widely visible in their surroundings as incongruous features.
12. Further to the above, I find that the proposal would, as a result of its overall scale and design, appear as an unduly bulky and incongruous addition that would fail to appear in proportion with, or subordinate to, the host property.
13. Consequently, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the Framework, to London Plan (2016) Policies 7.4B and 7.6B, to Core Strategy¹ Policy CS1.B, DMP² Policy DM1 and to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Living conditions

14. The proposed two storey extension would, to some small degree, infringe on the outlook from the closest rear bedroom window of No 60 Central Avenue. However, the distance from this window and the position of the proposed development would mean that any impact upon the outlook from No 60 would not be so great as to result in significant harm.
15. Taking this into account, the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 60 Central Avenue, with regards to outlook and would not be contrary to London Plan (2016) Policy 7.6B, to DMP Policy DM1, or to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010), which together amongst other things, seek to protect residential amenity.

¹ Reference: Harrow Core Strategy (2012).

² Reference: Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).

16. However, notwithstanding this, I have found that the proposed development would result in significant harm to local character, leading to the decision below.

Other Matters

17. The appellants, in support of their case, draw my attention to other developments nearby. However, the specific circumstances relating to each of these examples do not appear to me to be the same as those the subject of this appeal. Notwithstanding this, I have found that the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. This harm is significant and it is not something that is mitigated by the presence of other developments elsewhere.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR