



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2023

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3311271

47 Hillview Road, Pinner, Harrow HA5 4PB

- 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 Jerry Ball against the decision of Harrow Council.
 - The application Ref P/1568/22, dated 25 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side 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 and the area.

Reasons

3. The houses in Hillview Road are typically two storeys high, and semi-detached or detached. Whilst often of an individual design, they display many recurring features, such as bay windows, exposed timbers or decorative brick and tilework, and are finished in a palette of materials, including render and masonry.
4. The houses are set well back from the tree-lined carriageway, in fairly consistent building lines, behind grass verges, and often landscaped front gardens. This gives the area a cohesive, spacious and well-ordered ambience. In those regards, the host, which forms one half of a semi-detached pair, is typical of the area.
5. The proposed single storey side extension would be attached to the host's existing two storey side to rear extension. Compared to it, it would be much lower in height, its front face would be slightly recessed, it would have an identical window, and it would be faced in matching materials and bond.
6. However, taken together, the front face of this scheme with the existing side to rear extension, would be wider than the original house, and their footprint would be broadly similar to it. Consequently, whilst this scheme by itself would be modestly proportioned, considered cumulatively, the extensions would not appear subordinate to the original house, and the resultant property would have an unduly elongated, horizontal form.

7. Additionally, the proposed extension would significantly close the gap to 45 Hillview Road, and its corner would project forward of the corner of that property. Consequently, allowing for the curvature of the highway, it would breach the fairly consistent building line on this side of the road.
8. Although tall hedgerows to the front and side would, to a degree, restrict the scheme's visibility in some views, it would be clearly seen across the host's driveway, and I cannot be certain that those landscaping features will always be retained, and at their current height.
9. Summing up, whilst the scheme's style and materials would be appropriate, considered cumulatively with the existing extension, it would dominate the host property, whose original form and proportions would be overwhelmed, and its siting would not reflect the prevailing pattern of development in the area.
10. The proposal would therefore conflict with London Plan 2021 Policy D3 Parts D1) and D11), Harrow Core Strategy 2012 Policy CS1.B, and Harrow Development Management Policies 2013 Policy DM1. Amongst other things, these require a high standard of design which respects the host building, responds positively to local character, and enhances the local context, with regard to matters including siting, spacing, scale and proportions.
11. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework requirement for good design which is sympathetic to local character; and with the Harrow Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2010, which sets out at paragraph 6.6 that extensions should harmonise with the scale of the original building, and with the character of the area.
12. I note that no neighbours objected, but having considered the scheme on its planning merits, cumulatively with previous extensions, it would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would thus conflict with the development plan and, having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR