

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2016

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 05 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/16/3152246

38 Blythwood Road, Pinner, HA5 3QG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Amit Dodia against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/1471/16, dated 30 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2016.
 - The application sought planning permission for first floor front extension; first floor side extension; single storey rear extension; external alterations without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref P/5532/15, dated 15 February 2016.
 - The condition in dispute is No 6 which states that: The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 215163/01; 215163/02 Revision B.
 - The reason given for the condition is: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Extension works were underway at the time of my visit; this does not alter my approach to determining the merits of the proposal.
3. The Appellant is seeking a variation to the approved scheme via the use of a revised plan from that approved in planning permission Ref P/5532/15, dated 15 February 2016. The Appellant would wish to change drawing 215163/02 Revision B to Revision D, dated March 2016. As the Appellant puts it, this amendment would provide for 'the alteration of the approved drawing to include a window to the front gable addition over the window in the approved drawing'.

Main Issue

4. I consider the main issue to be the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider locality.
-

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal property is a two-storey, detached, hipped-roof home of pleasing front elevations undergoing extension works. Properties locally are predominantly set in similar sized plots with hipped roof ends and have a broadly common elevational design theme which comes together to create an area of established residential character and attractive suburban appearance.
6. The approved extension scheme embodies a forward projecting, but subsidiary scaled, new two storey gable with a door at ground level and a window above. The appeal scheme is effectively to change most of the upper 'triangle' of the gable to glazing in the form of a triangular window, atop the approved rectangular one, rather than walling. This approach can and does often work successfully in designs of modern idiom and tends to result in a relatively bold frontage which in some instances would be visually advantageous.
7. However, this property and almost all those found locally are of a more understated traditional suburban style with very pleasant but low key elevations, materials, fenestration and overall visual impact. The broad homogeneity of the area is an attribute and the appeal scheme would look ill at ease and jarring on the eye both in terms of the remainder of this dwelling and the wider scene. The proposal would run contrary to achieving good design and the protection of local distinctiveness.
8. Policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013 and Policy CS1B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) call for, amongst other matters, development to be appropriately designed for its site and setting and of a suitable form and character. I conclude that the appeal scheme would run contrary to these policies which have similar objectives to those embodied in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010) and Policies 7.4.B and 7.6B of The London Plan (2015).

Other matters

9. The Appellant's wish to improve and sympathetically extend the dwelling is understood and commendable. I understand why the Appellant may wish to achieve maximum light penetration. I recognise that this is not a Conservation Area and that replication is not always necessary in a streetscene; variation can add visual and architectural interest. Change often 'weathers-in' and the Appellant would be careful with selection of materials.
10. Nevertheless, as I outline above I am not persuaded that the proposed scheme is suitable for this particular dwelling and road or that it would display such architectural merit that there would be justification for running contrary to the vernacular style found locally.
11. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
12. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within the Framework.

Overall conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider locality. Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR