



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2022

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3298172

81 George V Avenue, Pinner, HA5 5SU

- 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 Arulkumaran Kansasamy against the decision of The London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref: P/0204/22 dated 2 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is Single storey front extension incorporating porch; two storey side extension; single and two storey rear extension; alterations to roof; rear dormer; rooflights in side roofslope; external alterations (demolition of attached garage).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue:

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of 81 King George V Avenue and the surrounding area.

Preliminary Matter:

3. The Council have used a description of development which differs from that appearing on the application form but more accurately reflects what appears on the drawings submitted. I have therefore used that description in the interests of clarity and do so without affecting the rights of any party. Further, as reasons explain, the appellant was invited to provide additional information by way of clarification and it is that drawing titled PRE-APP 02 Revision A dated 18 August 02 being a version of the submitted plans, to which I refer in this decision.

Reasons:

4. George V Avenue is a wide suburban highway largely formed of mid-twentieth-century housing of varying design, including recently extended dwellings. The appeal site (No.81) is a detached dwelling which, distinctively, largely retains its original form and character. In that regard the contribution of subtle architectural detailing to the appreciation of its use of materials and elegantly simple design is key. For instance, the extent of eaves and hipped-bay overhang and degree of inset from the external wall face of fenestration, material texture and cill projection contribute to the legibility of the building

as a solid form and, therefore its character and appearance as an example of typical post-war suburban housing¹.

5. Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Local Plan (2013) (DMLP) requires all development proposals to achieve a high standard of design and layout, which is supported by the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Residential Design² (Design Guide), requiring extensions to '*harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original dwellinghouse*'. The appellant refers to the altered state of other dwellings and suggests that the proposals would have no detrimental impact on the character of the existing dwelling or the character of the residential setting. However, it is the relatively original form and appearance of No.81, in which regard the contribution made by the detailing of eaves, overhangs and around openings is key, which attracts significant weight.
6. The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 at S7(1) requires applications for planning permission to include a plan which identifies the land to which the application relates but also '*any other plans, drawings and information necessary to describe the development which is the subject of the application*'. Notwithstanding the amended plan provided, the significance of such details and the overall roof form, to the character of the host dwelling is not reflected in the submitted proposals and a matter to which I will return.
7. The proposal would add significant width and depth, wrapping the original plan form and reducing the separation at upper floor level with the much-altered No.83, adjacent. Combined with an absence of set-back the result of the increased width would, notwithstanding differing external finishes, tend to contribute to a terracing effect and draw attention to even subtle changes in the colour and texture of facing materials resulting from the proposed works.
8. Elements of the proposal would not be obtrusive but even if some elements of what is proposed may, potentially, be permitted by Order³ as the appellant suggests, there is nothing before me to consider in that regard.
9. I have already referred to the extent of hipped bay and eaves projection which are not adequately represented in the submitted drawings; the original arched entrance recess would, according to the drawings provided, be replaced with a lean-to porch with a flush verge and lacking any evidence of detail appearing in the existing building. Even if the proposals were otherwise acceptable, I remain unconvinced that the necessary 'plans' condition would meet the test of enforceability due to the discrepancies I have identified.
10. As the appellant has already been allowed the opportunity⁴ to make further submission to demonstrate the architectural quality of the proposal, I could not reasonably grant consent subject to conditions seeking details for later approval when the drawings which have been submitted do not demonstrate an appreciation of the significance of those details.

¹ Post World War 2

² Adopted 2010

³ The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended

⁴ The appellant was allowed an opportunity to, and did, submit an amended plan (DRW2A)

11. What is before me indicates that the extent and bulk of the additions would, cumulatively, subsume the original built form to an unacceptable degree such that, overall, the proposal fails to demonstrate it would harmonise with the existing building and therefore conflicts with Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM1 of the DMLP and the relevant sections of the Council's Design Guide and could not, therefore, accord with the development plan taken as a whole.
12. I therefore conclude that, for the reasons given and taking all matters raised into account, the appeal cannot succeed.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR