



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2023

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3309458

233 Cannon Lane, Pinner, Harrow HA5 1JB

- 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 Sudhir Nilekar against the decision of Harrow Council.
 - The application Ref P/2312/22, dated 18 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as the construction a part ground and first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

3. The host comprises one half of a semi-detached pair, which has a distinctive gambrel roof, and timber detailing on its front face. It has a large flat-roofed first floor side extension and, like its attached neighbour, a ground floor rear projection with a steeply pitched gabled roof.
4. Along with a modest and unobtrusive ground floor extension, the proposal would involve the replacement of the rear gabled projection with a first floor extension. That extension's rectilinear, flat-roofed form would reflect the style of the existing side extension to which it would be attached.
5. However, given its form and proportions, and its rearward projection in this elevated position across part of the host's original rear face, it would have a bulky and dominant appearance, and it would be markedly at odds with the style and design of the original property. Considered cumulatively with the existing first floor side extension, the host's original form and style would be largely subsumed.
6. Consequently, whilst the proposed first floor extension would be faced in hanging tiles to match the existing side extension, and it would not be visible in the streetscene, that part of the scheme would not represent good design, and it would harm the character and appearance of the host property. The harm that it would cause would be clearly evident from nearby houses, including their rear gardens.

7. The appellant refers to extensions at 2 and 4 Wimborne Drive ('Nos 2 and 4') and a large extension at 239 Cannon Lane, all of which I observed from the appeal site. In particular, I noted that the form and style of the extensions to the semi-detached pair at Nos 2 and 4 appeared to be very similar to that proposed here. However, I have no details of those properties' planning histories, and in any event those examples do not address this scheme's poor design.
8. The appellant has concerns regarding the Council's handling of his application, and of his subsequent enquiry letter. However, I have dealt with the scheme before me on its planning merits, and against relevant policies and guidance.
9. Summing up, the proposed first floor rear extension would not represent good design and it would harm the character and appearance of the host property. It would thus conflict with Policy D3 Parts D1) and 11) of the London Plan 2021, Policy DM1 Parts A) and B) of the Harrow Development Management Policies 2013, and Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012. In general terms, and amongst other things, these require proposals to achieve a high standard of design, enhance local character and context with regard to matters such as shape, form and appearance, and require extensions to respect the host building.
10. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework requirement at Chapter 12 for good design as a key aspect of sustainable development, and with the Harrow Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2010, which requires extensions to harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building, and to not dominate it.
11. Having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR