



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2025

by T Bennett BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/24/3353699

9 Pinner Green, Pinner, Harrow HA5 2AF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Kamran Ahmad against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/1903/24.
 - The development proposed is solid glazed front and side extension with a glazed roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the determination of the application, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024. However, as the parts most relevant to the main issue in this appeal have not substantially changed, I have not gone back to the parties to seek further submissions. I consider no party has been prejudiced by this approach.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises an end terrace building on the corner of Pinner Green and Bell Close, with the ground floor currently in use as a restaurant. A petrol station lies to the south west with residential properties directly opposite.
5. The site forms part of a small parade of commercial and retail units, which are located either side of Bell Close, fronting Pinner Green. Whilst the host buildings of the commercial units display differing fenestration, there is a general consistency in architectural detailing, with the units uniformly set back from the highway, with a forecourt area at the front of them. This consistency contributes positively to the character of the parade.
6. The proposed development would introduce a flat-roofed single-storey extension to the front and side of the appeal property. This extension would significantly extend out in to the forecourt area, almost directly abutting the pavement. While the corner location prevents the proposal from appearing cramped, the extension, despite predominantly consisting of glazing, would, due to its corner location, scale and depth appear as a substantial, highly visible and intrusive addition to the street

scene, located prominently forward of the front elevation. The extension would appear as an incongruous addition, at odds with the consistent building line of the surrounding commercial and retail premises, and consequently would detract from the character and appearance of the area.

7. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposed development would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area. It would thus be contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021). This seeks, amongst other matters, development that positively responds to and enhances local character and distinctiveness. It would also conflict with Core Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) which has similar aims. The proposal would also be contrary to Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) (LP). This seeks proposals of a high standard of design and layout which enhances the local character and appearance having regard to, amongst other matters, the context provided by neighbouring buildings. It would also conflict with Policy DM4 of the LP which requires proposals for development on forecourts to be appropriate to the character of the area in which it is located.

Other Matters

8. I acknowledge that the host property is not a listed building nor is it within a Conservation Area. I also note the proposed development seeks to optimise the capacity of the site, potentially leading to increased footfall, with associated economic benefits, including the employment of additional staff. However, I am not persuaded that the proposal is the only manner in which these benefits could be achieved. As such, I afford this limited weight and overall find the identified visual harm outweighs the economic benefits of the development.

Conclusion

9. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

T Bennett

INSPECTOR