

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2016

by Jameson Bridgwater DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/16/3157384

69 The Avenue, Hatch End, Pinner HA5 4EL

- 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 Jivraj against the decision of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/2453/16 was refused by notice dated 27 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 69 The Avenue, Hatch End, Pinner HA5 4EL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2453/16, dated 20 May 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 8568-01 - Existing plans and elevations and 8568-01 – Proposed floor plans and elevations.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the development hereby permitted shall match in colour, form and texture those of the existing building.

Main issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The Avenue is a residential street which is suburban in character. The houses in the area are predominantly large detached and two-storey, set within generous plots. The houses are constructed from a variety of materials, but in the main, brick and render, with many retaining their original timber fenestration. The majority of the properties have private off street parking and generous rear gardens. The space between the dwellings, materials, fenestration and prominent roofs contribute to character and appearance of the area.
 4. Number 69 is a large two-storey hipped roof property finished in render with a substantial rear garden that backs onto the railway line. The property already
-

has been extended to the rear with a single/two storey flat roofed rear extension; the appellant has proposed to erect a single storey extension at the rear of the existing extension.

5. I accept that the proposed extension would result in a substantial cumulative increase in the size of the house when compared to the original dwelling; however, it would not appear cramped or overdeveloped given the generous size of the rear garden. Furthermore, the scale of the proposal would not materially harm or interrupt the distinguishing features and overall appearance of the host dwelling due to its siting, materials and particularly the simple design and form of the proposal, which relates well to the earlier extension. Moreover, the single storey extension would be sited to the rear of the property, screened from public view by the host dwelling and therefore would not have an adverse impact on the suburban character of the area. As such, the proposed extension would not be a disproportionate addition to the original dwellinghouse and would not result in harm to the character of the host dwelling or the area.
6. Having reached the conclusion above, the proposed single storey rear extension is therefore consistent with Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy, Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan and Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of the London Plan. These policies amongst other things seek to ensure that new buildings and extensions relate to their setting to protect and enhance local character. In reaching my conclusions I have also taken into account the Harrow Residential Design Guide SPD (2010).

Conditions and conclusion

7. In addition to the standard implementation condition, it is necessary for the avoidance of doubt, to define the plans with which the scheme should accord. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the scheme it is necessary for a condition to ensure the external materials match those of the host building.
8. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Jameson Bridgwater

INSPECTOR