



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:

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3288870
11 Thornton Grove PINNER HA5 4HG

- 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 Aman Sood against the decision of The London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3880/21, dated 20 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single and two storey rear extension, rear dormer; installation of two rooflights in the front roof slope; landscaping; external alterations; new vehicle crossover.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area
 - living conditions of neighbouring users

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Thornton Grove is a wide suburban street populated with large, generally two-storey detached houses which vary significantly in design but generally are provided with large, private, gardens. 11 Thornton Grove is an extended dwelling dating from the mid C20 which now appears to fill the width of its plot. In its original form and colour, redolent of that era, the roof would have appeared as a distinctive and positive feature in the surrounding area.
4. 13 Thornton Grove also extends across the width of its plot however this is achieved with less impactful, lower, side-rear extensions. 9 Thornton Grove by its smaller size and significant frontal greenery makes a subdued contribution to the street-scene and leaves a significant proportion of its plot width open above ground floor level allowing views to the rear.
5. The proposed extension, at first floor level, would double the depth of the existing accommodation and have the consequence of a very significant increase in the volume of an already-prominent roof, more than doubling what currently exists. Although inset from the boundaries and slightly below current ridge heights the resultant mass and form would be, to a significant degree,

disproportionate to what is currently apparent and significantly harm the original characteristic roof form.

6. Views of the proposed extended property would be limited from, but not entirely absent in, the street scene, however, the roof and first floor additions would extend well beyond the general depth of adjoining properties. The unrelieved bulk of built form thereby created would conspicuously contrast with the smaller scale and generally subordinate extensions to other properties in the area and appear unacceptably dominant by virtue of the height, depth and unrelieved bulk of the upper floor level and roof volume.
7. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies CS1B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), policies DM1 A or DM1 B of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan and with relevant sections of the Harrow Residential Design Guide SPD which, taken together, seek to protect the character of suburban areas, to ensure extensions respect host buildings and achieve a good standard of design.

Neighbouring user

8. The large private gardens of nearby dwellings relate to a broadly consistent rear alignment of upper-storey built form which the proposed extension would breach to a significant degree. The main built form of 9 Thornton Grove sits at some distance from the appeal property, such that its relatively modest scale combined with the openness above its garage and side extension would tend to emphasise the height, depth and unrelieved bulk of the proposed first floor extension along the boundary and the prominent roof would be more widely visible. In consequence the development would result in an overbearing and dominant appearance which would unacceptably harm the outlook from, and quiet visual character of, the adjoining amenity spaces of No. 9 Thornton Grove.
9. The proposal would, therefore, conflict with parts B(a), C and D(e) of policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan and with the Residential Design Guide SPD which together seek to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and ensure development does not have an unacceptable visual impact upon outdoor spaces.
10. I therefore conclude that the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area and cause unacceptable detriment to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. For the reasons given it would fail to accord with the development plan taken as a whole. In reaching my decision I have had regard to the appellant's comments, however, for the reasons given, these do not change my conclusion which is that whilst the extension would provide additional living space within the property, that does not alter my view that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR