



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2026

by A Hunter LLB (Hons) PG Dip MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/25/3376421

20 South Close, Pinner, Harrow HA5 5AE

- 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 Dillan Gandhi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/1814/25.
 - The development proposed is described as a “First floor extension to side. Conversion of garage to habitable space with single storey porch extension to front.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Reason for refusal no.2 on the Council’s notice of decision relates to the effects of the proposed development on “no.20 South Close”, which is the appeal site. However, the Council’s report identified harm to the occupiers of the neighbouring property, no.21. I have determined the appeal based on the reference to no.20 in reason for refusal no.2 being an error, and it having meant to say no.21. The appellant’s statement has been prepared on this basis, and I do not consider there would be any unfairness to either party by this course of action.
3. I have been made aware that the New Local Plan Proposed Submission (Regulation 19) Version (2021-2041) (NLPPS), has been submitted for examination. There has been no conflict identified with any policies of the NLPPS, and the appeal has also been determined on this basis.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property, the pair of semi-detached properties, and the immediate area, with particular regard to its scale and design, and;
 - the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at no.21, with particular regard to outlook and daylight.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The host property is a semi-detached dwelling that originally had a hipped roof, which has been subsequently altered to be gabled, unlike the vast majority of other

semi-detached properties in this cul-de-sac location, most of which are arranged to face onto a central area. The appeal property has already been extended, including a garage to its side, and it and its adjoining property, no.19, are positioned much further back than no.21, to its opposite side. No's 19 has retained its hipped roof and has been extended to its side at both ground and first floor level, with parts that have different setbacks from its front elevation, although their ridge heights are below the height of the main property's roof ridge.

6. Many of the nearby properties have had extensions to the side of their hipped roofs, with some variety in the design and appearance of these extensions (including a flat roof at no.24). The tight arrangement of these properties means there are few spaces between them, particularly between those that have been extended to their sides, and where there are spaces, the limited views between them is mostly towards mature planting beyond their boundaries. I saw there was one other semi-detached property on this road that had been altered to have a gabled roof, but that property did not have an extension to its side.
7. Harrow's Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Design Guide, adopted December 2010 (SPD) says extensions should harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building and the character of the area, and that the roofs of first floor or two storey extensions should reflect the design of the existing roof. The SPD also says side extensions should have a minimum set-back from the first-floor front wall by at least 1 metre and have a subordinate pitched roof. It adds that where the property has already been extended by the conversion of a hipped to a gabled roof, a further side extension (first floor or two storey) is inappropriate, as such developments would likely be incompatible with the design, character, bulk and appearance of the locality.
8. Whilst the proposed first floor extension would have its roof height lower than the main roof, it would not have a significant setback from the appeal property's front elevation (less than 1 metre), and its proposed hipped roof form would jar with its altered gable roof form. As a result, its illegible design would not harmonise with the existing appearance of the host property, and it would add an incongruous addition onto its side, which would be visible from parts of South Close. Moreover, views of it in combination with the adjoining semi-detached property would be of an uncoordinated mixture of roof heights, and forms, that would harmfully contrast with the appearance of the host property, the pair of semi-detached properties, and the immediate area.
9. Although the proposed first floor extension would infill part of the space between the host property and no.21, the existing view through the space above the single storey structures is towards mature planting immediately beyond the rear boundary of the appeal site, which does not positively contribute to the character and appearance of the immediate area. Consequently, I did not find that infilling part of this space in principle would be unacceptable. For similar reasons, and considering the forward siting of no.21, I was not persuaded that the proposal would create an unacceptable terracing effect, particularly taking into account the close relationship of other properties within the inner part of the cul-de-sac. Nevertheless, this did not outweigh the above identified harm.
10. The Council has not raised objections to the proposed conversion of the garage and the proposed porch to the front elevation, and I also concur that they would be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the host property, the pair of

semi-detached properties, and the area. However, the inclusion of these aspects, along with the use of suitable matching materials, window designs, and its proposed modest width, together with no.21's side extension and outbuildings being only single storey, would not address the above identified harm, and as they are inherently linked to the proposed first floor extension, it is not possible for them to be separated and for a split decision to be issued to approve those elements of the proposed development.

11. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property, the pair of semi-detached properties and the immediate area, and it would conflict with Policy D3 of The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, dated March 2021 (LP), Policy CS1 of Harrow's Core Strategy dated February 2012 (CS), and Policy DM1 of Harrow's Development Management Policies, dated July 2013 (DMP), that amongst other things require development to have a high standard of design, including a roof form that positively contributes to local distinctiveness, and for extensions to reflect the host property. In addition, there would be conflict with the SPD, in terms of the requirements set out above.

Living conditions – occupiers of no. 21

12. The proposed first floor extension would run parallel to the side boundary with no.21, and due to that property's forward position, it would extend some 5.7 metres or so beyond its rear elevation (at first floor level). Immediately abutting the common boundary are single storey outbuildings belonging to no.21. There are first floor windows on no.21 that could be affected by the proposed first floor extension; these are 2 no. windows on its side elevation, and 2 no. windows on its rear elevation.
13. The SPD says the size and siting of buildings must avoid unreasonable loss of light to, or overshadowing adjoining buildings and spaces. It also says a 45-degree code will be used in conjunction with site circumstances to determine the appropriate relationship between buildings and 'protected' windows (defined as the main or primary windows to habitable rooms and kitchens larger than 13 square metres). The Council says the horizontal part of the 45-degree code is most relevant, which says two and three storey buildings (including any projecting roof eaves) should not interrupt a 45-degree line drawn on plan from the nearest first floor or two storey corner of a neighbouring building.
14. DMP Policy DM1 states amongst other things, that the assessment on amenity should consider the adequacy of light and outlook within buildings, including habitable rooms and outdoor spaces, and that the 45-degree code should be applied where relevant.
15. The appellant's drawing shows that not only does its existing rear dormer extension already encroach into the 45-degree line from the rear corner side of no.21, but the proposed first floor extension would also further encroach into this area. The proposal would therefore breach the 45-degree horizontal code.
16. Notwithstanding the outbuildings and boundary treatment that would adjoin the proposed extension, and its proposed hipped roof, the significant mass and bulk of the proposed first floor extension in such close proximity to no.21 would be visually dominant, enclosing and overbearing for the occupiers of that property, from within their rear garden, creating an unacceptable sense of enclosure and harming their

living conditions. Consequently, I am not persuaded that the site circumstances, including the site's context and suburban location would justify the conflict with the horizontal 45-degree code in this case. Although I do accept that its siting and scale would not unacceptably reduce daylight into the rear garden of the adjoining property, given its overall size, and the position of the adjoining outbuildings.

17. In view of the arrangement of ground floor extensions and the outbuilding at no.21, and the high-level position of its second-floor openings, its first-floor windows would mostly be affected by the proposed first floor extension. The appellant has said, of those closest 4 no. first floor windows, only one would be a protected window on the rear side, understood to serve a bedroom (the others are said to serve bathrooms and a landing). The appellant's diagram, in their grounds of appeal, shows there would be some minor encroachment from the proposed extension when looking out of that rear bedroom window, but it is not shown to be within the 45-degree part. In terms of all those closest first-floor windows, I am content that their respective positions and separation distances would mean there would not be an unacceptable loss of light or a harmful outlook for the occupiers of no.21 because of the proposed first floor extension.
18. The Council has not identified any unacceptable effects on the living conditions of the occupiers of no.21 regarding the proposed porch and garage conversion, and from my own observations I see no reason to disagree.
19. I therefore conclude that although there would not be an unacceptable loss of daylight or harmful outlook for occupiers within the property itself, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the outlook of the occupiers of no.21 from within their rear garden, which would harm their living conditions. In doing so, I find the proposed development would conflict with the relevant parts of LP Policy D3, and DMP Policy DM1 that require new development to deliver an appropriate outlook and amenity, including from within outdoor spaces, and when applying the Council's 45-degree code. The proposed development would also be inconsistent with the SPD in terms of the requirements set out above.

Conclusion

20. I therefore conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole, and there are no other considerations, such as those raised by the appellant in terms of the improvements to their internal accommodation and facilitating multi-generational living, which outweigh that conflict. For the reasons outlined above, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Hunter

INSPECTOR