The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2022

by A. J. Boughton MA(IPSD), Dip.Arch, Dip.Conservation, RIBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 FEBRUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3283654
1 Ashdene, Pinner, HA5 3PD

- 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 Amrit Patel against the decision of The London Borough of Harrow.
- The application Ref P/1943/21, dated 8 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2021.
- The development proposed is two storey side extension, loft conversion with two front windows and porch.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development on the decision notice differs from that applied for by specific reference to parts of the proposal. Given the singularity of the issue for determination and the conclusion reached, it is not necessary to disaggregate elements for individual consideration and I have therefore retained the original description of development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect upon the character and appearance of the area arising from the proposed extension and associated works.

Reasons

4. No.1 Ashdene sits within a deep residential plot which defines the eastern side of 'Ashdene' a short cul-de-sac. The subject property is located at the corner with High View, a wide suburban road populated by substantial residential properties of mostly individual mid-twentieth-century design, providing a spacious leafy environment into which 1 Ashdene appears as a later but respectful insertion. The original design successfully articulates the change in direction of its two principal facades at this prominent corner. Significantly, although referred to as a side elevation, the elevation which faces High View adopts some architectural features and conventions frequently found in the main elevations of suburban dwellings, notably the projecting two-storey hipped bay and tile-hung upper wall areas.

5. The effect of the proposed side extension would be to amalgamate these features into a monolithic form beneath a wide hipped roof leaving only one small setback on the east elevation. Although the extension would appear to

align with frontages of neighbouring properties the resultant cramping of the relationship with the plot boundary splay would not accord with the generally spacious fore-gardens typical of most neighbouring properties such that the extension would appear prominent and not subordinate to the host dwelling.

6. This incongruity with the surrounding development would be further emphasised by the scale and height of the proposed glazed mural and its eye-catching design which bears little relationship to the characteristic subdued and domestic scale fenestration found in the host dwelling and in the locality and would therefore fail to ensure that the proposal harmonises with either the existing building or the surrounding area.

7. The most relevant policies in this matter are Policies CS1B of the Harrow Core Strategy, DM1 and DM23 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan together with the guidance provided for householder extensions set out in the Harrow Residential Design Guide SPD which together seek to ensure development achieves a high design quality and that domestic extensions not only harmonise with the host building but also the surrounding

8. area.

9. I note the appellant argues compliance in certain respects with the SPD and the proposal seeks to retain positive qualities of the existing design. However, on balance and having regard to the configuration of the proposal on the site I conclude that the design and scale of the extension would result in a unacceptably cramped relationship with a prominent boundary. Taken with the unnecessarily obtrusive mural, the proposed development would not achieve the high standard of design and layout required. The relocation of parking with a new access point would add to this uncharacteristic cramping effect.

10. Refusal reason 3 identifies harm to character and appearance by loss of grassy frontage consequent upon the displacement of current parking arrangements. From my observations there are significant areas of non-grassy surfacing found on other frontages in the area and I must observe that the change of surface would not of itself contribute significantly to the change in character and appearance of the area. In any event, as the appellant observes, permission would not be required for such change being development permitted by Class F in Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order.

11. However, the frontage garden is prominently open in the street scene and its use for parking consequent upon the construction of a new pavement crossover would be obtrusive. A large proportion of the space available in the proposal would be occupied by vehicles, leaving insufficient opportunity for planting or screening of the quality generally found in the locality. This would add to the impact of the proposal on character and appearance and be contrary to the objectives of Policy DM23 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan which seeks provision of planting and landscaping in such situations.

12. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would not accord with the Development Plan taken as a whole and, consequently, having regard to all matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR