



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 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/21/3286611**  
**4 Eastern Avenue PINNER HA5 1NP**

- 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 Abdur Rouff against the decision of The London Borough of Harrow.
  - The application Ref P/2057/21, dated 13 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2021.
  - The development proposed is two storey side extension, part first floor rear extension and single storey front extension.
- 

### 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. Eastern Avenue is a busy suburban street almost entirely comprised of two storey semi-detached family homes of broadly similar design with good-sized outdoor amenity areas. The character of the appeal locality is generated by the grain of repetition along the street, a consistency of scale, appearance and main roof form which is a key characteristic.
4. The appeal property is the penultimate property at the eastern end of the Avenue. Already significantly enlarged by hip-to-gable roof additions and disproportionate single-storey rear extension, the character of the host dwelling is at some distance from its original form and that of its neighbours.
5. The Council acknowledge the decision of Inspector Dean<sup>1</sup> in granting a two-storey side extension to the property and I agree in this instance that, notwithstanding my preceding assessment, the frontal appearance of the proposed front extension and limited side extension would not differ significantly from those found at neighbouring properties and in this regard would not harm the street scene.

---

<sup>1</sup> APP/M5450/D/20/3254671

6. However, the proposed first-floor rear extension in this matter would project well beyond the original rear wall of the host dwelling and extend across more than half of the plot width requiring an obtrusive, contrived junction at roof level with the existing full width rear dormer. The appellant has drawn attention to other extensions in the area however, in this case, the cumulative effect of the proposal with existing extensions would result in a disproportionate scale of development, almost wholly masking the original building form in the wider views at the rear due to its bulk and scale.
7. The development proposed would, therefore, be detrimental to the character of this suburban area, failing to respect the host building or the local context. The proposal would conflict with Policies D3(1) of the London Plan (2021); CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan which, taken together, seek to protect the character of suburban areas, to reinforce local distinctiveness, respond appropriately to local characteristics, and have regard to scale of the proposal in relation to its setting.

#### *Neighbouring users*

8. No.2 and No.6 Eastern Avenue have, like many neighbouring houses in the locality, infilled intervening frontage gaps with two storey extensions. But, in contrast to the host property which has built over a majority of its amenity area, both adjoining houses have largely retained their original rear gardens which, due to their northerly prospect, have reduced access to sunlight. The effect of the proposed side extension to No. 4, by reason of its projection beyond the rear elevation and height would be to further reduce access to sunlight in both adjoining gardens and by reason of proximity and intrusive appearance have an overbearing impact upon the outdoor space of No. 6 due to its depth on the shared boundary.
9. The proposal would conflict with policies D3(7) of the London Plan (2021); CS1B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012); 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. Therefore, having regard to all matters raised and for the reasons given, I conclude that the development would fail to accord with the Development Plan taken as a whole and in consequence, the appeal must fail.

*Andrew Boughton*

INSPECTOR