



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 November 2024

**by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 20 November 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/24/3352485**  
**52 Meadow Road, Pinner, Harrow, HA5 1ED**

- 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 Naman Bhatt against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
  - The application Ref is PL/1311/24.
  - The development proposed is double storey side extension, a single storey front extension, a double storey rear extension, a single storey rear extension, a dormer loft conversion and a drop kerb.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matters

2. The description of the proposed development is taken from the application form. The Council describes the proposed development as a "single storey front extension incorporating front porch; conversion of garage into habitable room; first floor side extension; single and two storey side to rear extension; rear dormer; external alterations; vehicle access."

## Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area; and its effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with regards to outlook and privacy.

## Reasons

### *Character and appearance*

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located in a residential area characterised by the presence of largely detached and semi-detached one and two storey dwellings.
  5. Houses in the area are set back from the road behind parking areas and garden frontages and have longer gardens to the rear. Meadow Road is a relatively wide street and the presence of front gardens and street trees provides for an attractive green and spacious character.
-

6. The area's attributes are further enhanced by the varied appearance of dwellings. There are for example, numerous pairs of inter-war semi-detached dwellings which have retained attractive period features. Whilst a number of these pairs of dwellings have been altered and/or extended over time, such changes generally appear in keeping with the host dwellings, their attached neighbours and the surrounding area.
7. During my site visit, I observed that the sense of symmetry presented by pairs of semi-detached dwellings along Meadow Drive makes a significant positive contribution to local character.
8. Together with Number 54 Meadow Drive, the appeal property forms one of a pair of dwellings with distinctive original features including cat-slide roofs, attached garages and simple porches which emphasise the pleasing visual impact of modest, curved double-height bay windows. The overall symmetry and appearance of these two attached dwellings is strikingly attractive.
9. The proposed development would replace the existing main entrance with a porch of such height, width and overall scale that it would appear unduly bulky. The porch would project well-beyond the existing bay and would, due to its siting, projection and bulky appearance, overwhelm and visually dominate this existing feature.
10. The harm arising from this would be exacerbated by the awkward and incongruous appearance of the proposed front and side extensions. A ground floor front extension would project forward of the host dwelling's bay windows and together with the proposed porch, would introduce an alien form of development by stepping well-forward of the build line of this pair of dwellings.
11. The dwelling's distinctive cat-slide roof would be replaced by a large and bulky new roof, which would appear out of keeping and jar with that of the attached dwelling. The visual harm arising would be increased as a result of the proposed ground and first floor additions, the proposed fenestration of which would fail to match that of the host dwelling. Also, the proposed roof above the front extension would appear awkward and incongruous when seen in the same context as the roof form of the attached neighbouring dwelling.
12. Together, the proposed changes above would severely unbalance the appearance of Nos 52 and 54 Meadow Road and this would be to the detriment of local character.
13. In addition to the above, the proposed rear dormer would fail to appear as a visually contained feature, but would instead, due to its siting, form and scale, dominate the rear roofslope and appear as an incongruous addition.
14. Further, the proposed dormer would combine with the proposed rear extensions to result in a development of such scale and bulk as to visually overwhelm the appearance of the host dwelling. Consequently, the proposed development would not comprise a subordinate addition would appear out of scale with and subsume the host dwelling.
15. Taking the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National

Planning Policy Framework; to London Plan (2021) Policy D3; to DMP<sup>1</sup> Policy DM1; and to the Council's Residential Design Guide<sup>2</sup>, which together amongst other things, seek to protect residential amenity.

*Living conditions*

16. The proposed first floor rear extension would project a considerable distance to the rear. I find that, whilst there would be a gap above ground floor level between the proposed extension and the shared rear boundary with No 54, the proposed projection of the first floor extension would be so long as to result in it appearing visually intrusive when seen from No 54's rear-facing first floor windows.
17. The harm arising from this would be most acute in respect of the outlook from No 54's nearest first floor window. I find that, from this window, the proposed first floor extension would appear as a visually dominant and overbearing feature.
18. The proposed development to the rear of the appeal dwelling would introduce large areas of glazing at ground, first and roof level. The proposed first floor rear extension would result in the presence of large areas of glazing in very close proximity to and providing for views down onto and across, the rear garden of Number 50 Meadow Road.
19. I find that this would result in perceived overlooking, as well as scope for actual overlooking of this neighbouring property. Whilst I observed that some degree of overlooking of neighbouring gardens in this location is always likely to occur, I find that in this case, the degree of overlooking and the perception of overlooking that would arise from the proposal would be so significant as to result in harm to the privacy of the occupiers of No 50.
20. Taking the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with regards to outlook and privacy, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to London Plan (2021) Policy D3; to DMP Policy DM1; and to the Council's Residential Design Guide, which together amongst other things, seek to protect residential amenity.

**Conclusion**

21. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

*N McGurk*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Reference: Harrow Development Management Policies (2013).

<sup>2</sup> Reference: Harrow Supplementary Planning Guidance Residential Design Guide (2010).