



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 June 2021

by Jonathon Parsons MSc BSc(Hons) DipTP Cert(Urb) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3268879

26 The Glen, Pinner HA5 5AY

- 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 & Mrs Hasan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3485/20, dated 29 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey part front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The London Plan (LP) 2021 was adopted on 2 March and supersedes the London Plan 2016 (with Consolidated Alterations since 2011). LP Policy D6 is relevant now instead of previous LP design policies.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a single storey bungalow with accommodation within a roof. It has a flat roofed side extension slightly stepped back from its main frontage and although to the rear, a visible flat-roofed dormer extension on the other side.
5. The surrounding area has a mix of housing types and architectural designs. However, the subject property and the adjacent dwellings of 28 and 30 The Glen have similar styles and forms. In particular, these properties have distinctive hipped frontage elements which are lower in height than the main roof. At 28 The Glen, one of the frontage elements is an extension but it has nevertheless been designed with a lower height hipped roof to accord with this locally distinctive and attractive architectural feature.
6. The proposed front extension would be set back from the existing front hipped gable by approximately 1.35m. However, it would stretch across the front of the main part of the dwelling and the extension to the side. Such an extension would be noticeably wider and larger than the frontage projecting wing and with a strikingly different roof design. In this regard, there would be a large

expanse of flat roof behind an upward sloping mono-pitch roof to the front and side. Overall, the extension would appear be ill-proportioned and poorly related to the dwelling by reason of its bulk and unsympathetic design.

7. There are properties with flat roofed extensions at 11 and 14 Downs Avenue, 68 Church Avenue and 23 The Glen but inevitably, proposals will differ from one another in their nature and planning context. At 23 The Glen, the proposal relates to the rear of the property, despite being visible from the road. The other properties are not within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site at The Glen, being in different streets, and in any case, the single storey extensions are different in that their width does not extend across both the front of a dwelling and an extension to the side like the appeal proposal. At Church Avenue, the dwelling is two storey as opposed to the appeal proposal's scale of single storey, with accommodation within the roof. Therefore, there are material differences between these developments and the proposal before me, and in any case, every application has to be considered on its particular planning merits.
8. For all these reasons, the development would not amount to a high standard of design and would harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would be contrary to Policy D6 of LP, Policy CS1B of the Harrow Core Strategy (CS) 2012 and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (DMPLP) 2013.

Other matters

9. The proposal would provide easier access for the elderly and infirm. The extension would allow more light into the property, particularly in the afternoon/early evening and would also permit more natural surveillance of the front garden. There would also be greater internal circulation space and additional provision of a utility room made possible by the extension.
10. However, it has not been demonstrated that there are no other ways of designing an extension in an acceptable way with the same benefits. In any case, the harm to the character and appearance of the area would be significant and these benefits would be limited being largely restricted to those living in the property. Therefore, these considerations would not individually or cumulatively outweigh the harm of the proposal.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area in conflict with LP, CS and DMPLP policies, and the development plan taken as a whole. There are no considerations of sufficient weight or importance that determine that the decision should be taken other than in accordance with the development plan and therefore, planning permission should be refused. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathon Parsons

INSPECTOR