



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 March 2023

by E Pickernell BSc MSC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/22/3307100

31 Barrow Point Avenue, Pinner, Harrow HA5 3HD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr A Sagar against the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/2287/22, is dated 16 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extensions to existing detached bungalow including changes to roof to form barn hip end roof extensions enclosing garage conversion and extended pitched roof at the rear, 3 front roof lights, one rear dormer, 2 roof lights in rear roof slope, single storey side and rear extension with skylights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission for alterations and extensions to existing detached bungalow including changes to roof to form barn hip end roof extensions enclosing garage conversion and extended pitched roof at the rear, 3 front roof lights, one rear dormer, 2 roof lights in rear roof slope, single storey side and rear extension with skylights is refused.

Background and Main Issue

2. Since the appeal has been made, the Council has provided a reason for which they would have refused planning permission, had they retained jurisdiction to do so. The appellant has had the opportunity to respond to this in their final comments therefore, they would not be prejudiced by my taking these into account.
3. The main issue is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is on a residential road of mixed character. The appeal property which is one of a group of 4 bungalows located near a bend in the road. These have hipped roofs and single storey front projections.
5. It is proposed to extend the roof upwards and to the side and to create barn hips. This additional mass at roof level would result in a bulky and top-heavy appearance to the dwelling when viewed from the road, which would not reflect the proportions of the existing dwelling or others in the area. The design of the roof including the barn hips, combined with the wide front facing gable, would result in an alien and incongruous addition to the street scene, at odds with the

existing character that comprises dwellings of conventional, domestic proportions.

6. I acknowledge that there are a variety of building forms in the area, and I note that the appellant contends that subservience to the main dwelling is not required in this instance. However, this does not alter my findings that the extension would fail to respond positively to its context and would be of an inappropriate design. I also understand the wishes of the appellant to provide additional space for their family. However, little weight can be attached to such personal circumstances.
7. My attention has been drawn to 1 Barrow Point Avenue which has been described as having a Dutch Barn style roof. It is a large detached two storey dwelling which has a different roof form than proposed and has a different relationship with the road and surrounding properties. I therefore find limited similarities with the appeal proposals. I have also been provided with details of a recent Prior Approval for the construction of an additional storey to the appeal property. However, I find that the approved scheme would have a more acceptable appearance than the scheme before me. In any event I have determined the appeal based on the submitted plans and documents.
8. Consequently, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area, contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan (March 2021) and Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (February 2012), Policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies (July 2013). Amongst other things these policies seek to ensure that development proposals respond positively to local context and distinctiveness and are of a high quality design. It would also conflict with the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted 15 December 2010) which seeks to ensure that extensions harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building, and the character of the area. Furthermore, it would conflict with relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seek to ensure that development achieves a high standard of design and is sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

9. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed, and planning permission is refused.

E Pickernell

INSPECTOR