



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2022

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27TH June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3295905

37 Central Avenue, Pinner HA5 5BT

- 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 S Devani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/4697/21, dated 24 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is a first floor front extension, a single storey side extension, and external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of the proposal from the appeal form, which is broadly consistent with the decision notice.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2010 ('SPD') sets out that extensions should harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building, and with the character of the area. At paragraph 6.66 it notes that roof form makes a significant contribution to an area's character, and that alterations should complement the original street character and should not dominate buildings, or impair their proportions.
5. The host comprises one half of a broadly symmetrical semi-detached pair. To the front each has a prominent two storey bay window, along with a single storey side wing with a large cat-slide roof.
6. Elsewhere along Central Avenue the dwellings are set back from the road, and mostly semi-detached and finished in painted render. Whilst there are some one and a half storey houses with front facing dormers, the properties are predominantly of a broadly similar architectural style to No 37, characterised by bay windows and expansive sections of roof which slope down to the ground floor eaves.

7. The scheme would be faced in matching materials, with traditional eaves detailing, and its roof would be set down below this semi-detached pair's main ridgeline. However, as No 35 has not been similarly extended at first floor, the proposal would significantly reduce this building's symmetry.
8. Additionally, whilst the proposed section of flat crown roof would be high up and thus not clearly visible in the streetscene, the proposal would result in the loss of most of the front facing cat-slide roof, which contributes to Central Avenue's locally distinctive character.
9. The form of the proposed extension would be similar to an adjacent extension at No 39. However, that dwelling is set further back from the road where it is less prominent in the streetscene than this scheme would be. Moreover, that development pre-dates the current advice in the SPD, and neither it, nor the side extensions on the semi-detached pair at 51 and 53 Central Avenue, are typical of the road.
10. Amongst other things, and in general terms, Policy D3 Parts D1) and D11) of The London Plan 2021, Policy CS1 Part B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies 2013, require proposals to be of a high design standard, respect the host building, and respond to local distinctiveness and character, having regard to matters such as appearance and shape.
11. For the above reasons, the scheme would not harmonise with the style of the host, it would unbalance its relationship with No 35, and it would fail to adequately respect the area's prevailing architectural character. As it would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area, the scheme would conflict with the policies above, and with the advice in the SPD.
12. Having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR