



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2025

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/24/3355404

43 Lulworth Drive, Pinner, Harrow HA5 1NF

- 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 Mr Rajeev Kumar Goreja against the decision of Harrow Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2239/24.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side to rear extension, a single storey rear extension, a single storey front extension incorporating a porch, decking at the rear (and demolition of an attached garage, side extension and rear conservatory).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Rajeev Kumar Goreja against Harrow Council. This is the subject of a separate decision.

Procedural Matter

3. The latest version of the National Planning Policy Framework was published in December 2024 ('Framework'). It is therefore that version that I have considered, rather than the now superseded version which was in place at the time of the Council's decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

5. Lulworth Drive is predominantly characterised by semi-detached, two storey properties, with prominent bay windows and other detailing typical of their era. Whilst originally hipped-roofed, many, including the host, have had hip to gable alterations, and I observed that some have had two storey, or first floor, side extensions, including No 65 which was allowed at appeal¹.
6. The Harrow Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2010 ('SPD') sets out, amongst other things that extensions should harmonise with and not dominate the original building (paragraphs 6.6 and 6.11); that rear extensions

¹ Ref: APP/M5450/D/23/3326367

should be designed to respect its character and scale (paragraph 6.58); and that side extensions should reflect the pattern of development in the streetscene (paragraph 6.37).

7. The proposed two storey side extension would be set back from the host's front face at first floor, and its roof would be set down and hipped to reflect the form of the original building. Having regard to the third paragraph of the Council's assessment under 'Design' in its delegated report, I agree with both principal parties that its front face would not appear out of place in this fairly diverse streetscene; although its long and unalleviated first floor side wall would have a rather stark appearance through the gap to No 45 when approaching along Lulworth Drive from the west.
8. The proposed side extension would project well beyond the original property's rear face, where it would sit above part of an approved and recently constructed 6 metre deep single storey rear extension². The rear projecting first floor would add considerable bulk and complexity to the building, and its hipped roof would cut across a large, rectilinear dormer extension, resulting in an awkward junction between these two additions.
9. I observed on my visit that many nearby properties on this side of Lulworth Drive have single storey rear extensions and that some have large rear dormer windows. However, none that I am aware of, including No 65, have a combination of rear extensions whose scale, bulk and complexity are similar to the resultant property here. Having regard to cumulative impacts, the proposal would therefore result in a disjointed development, which would dominate the original building, such that very little of its form, style or character would remain legible.
10. Whilst little of the scheme's harmful impact would be visible in the streetscene, it would appear incongruous and overly bulky viewed from nearby dwellings and their rear gardens.
11. Both parties reference schemes elsewhere in support of their case; and cite the importance of consistency in decision making. In that regard I note, in particular, the similarities between this scheme and the partially allowed appeal at 34 Rowlands Avenue³. However, compared to it, the first floor rear face of this scheme would be slightly wider, its first floor side wall would be slightly longer, and the existing dormer is less bulky. Moreover, I do not have all the details of that site's context, nor the others cited by the parties, including at 79 Kenton Park Crescent⁴, so I cannot draw meaningful conclusions regarding any similarities between them on the main issue in this appeal.
12. For these reasons, the scheme would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and this area. It would thereby conflict with London Plan (2021) ('LP') Policy D3, and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies (2013). Amongst other things, and in general terms, these require a high standard of design which, whilst being supportive of optimising site capacity and incremental densification, responds positively to local character and distinctiveness, and to the site's context, having regard to matters such as appearance, shape, form, scale, bulk and massing.

² Ref: P/3812/22

³ Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3270651

⁴ Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3325776

13. It would also conflict with the advice at paragraphs 6.6, 6.11 and 6.58 of the SPD. Whilst the appellant raises concerns regarding the age of that document, which pre-dates the development plan, its general design principles are consistent with its policies. Where the SPD takes a rather inflexible approach at paragraph 6.57 in relation to side extensions following a hip to gable conversion, I have found that such a form of development would not be unacceptable as a matter of principle.
14. In its favour, the scheme would make an efficient use of the land and it would provide additional internal space for the occupants. However, whilst Framework paragraph 135 supports the creation of places with a high standard of amenity, and both it and LP Policy D1 support appropriate innovation, growth and change, it would conflict with their requirements for development to be sympathetic to local character.
15. The scheme's limited benefits would not outweigh the significant harm that it would cause. Having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR