



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 March 2023

**by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 20<sup>th</sup> April 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/23/3315624**

**29 Malpas Drive, Pinner HA5 1DQ**

- 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 Toshak Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
  - The application Ref P/3246/22, dated 12 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 November 2022.
  - The development proposed is first floor front and rear extension, single storey front and rear extension, loft extension with rear dormer.
- 

### 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 building and surrounding area.

### Reasons

3. Malpas Drive mainly comprises detached 2 storey houses. The appeal property shares a distinct architectural style with several other houses within the street despite some having been extended or altered. Common features include exposed brick at ground floor level and white render on the first floor. Windows at first floor level have what appear to be decorative shutters and comprise a central dual paned window with triple paned windows either side which provide an element of symmetry. Roofs are hipped and of similar proportions although, because the road slopes near the appeal site, ridge heights on neighbouring houses are lower on one side of the appeal property and higher on the other.
4. Several houses, including the appeal property, have extended porches at the front which attach to side garages with a single pitched roof along their length. Garages have been converted on a few houses and, in the case of the host property, there is a first floor extension above the garage. Nonetheless, the features I have described contribute to the distinctive character and appearance of the host property and nearby houses and thus the wider street scene.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010) (SPD) advises that extensions should harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building and the character of the area.

6. The proposal includes extending the ground floor projecting porch across the full frontage of the house. Its single pitched roof would be interrupted by a first floor extension that would create a gable ended bay above the front door with a floor to ceiling window. Both elements would appear incongruous and at odds with the design of similar houses nearby. Furthermore, the floor to ceiling window would be out of proportion with existing windows and its offset position would interrupt the symmetry that I have identified as contributing to the character of the host property and similar buildings. The roof would be raised higher than that of both neighbouring houses to accommodate the proposed first floor and dormer extensions to the rear of the house. This would further draw attention to the differences in scale and architectural style that would result from the proposed development, and its failure to harmonise with the existing building and those like it.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021), Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies (2013) and the SPD which require high quality design that positively responds to local distinctiveness and character.

### **Other Matters**

8. I have had regard to local residents' concerns regarding the legibility of the plans submitted, the effect of the proposed development on their living conditions and its proximity to their boundary. However, these do not add to my reasons for dismissing the appeal.
9. I have considered the examples of other extensions nearby provided by the appellant, but none appeared to be directly comparable with the current appeal proposal. In any case, I have come to my own view regarding the development rather than relying on the approach the Council may have taken elsewhere.

### **Conclusion**

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*P D Sedgwick*

INSPECTOR