

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/16/3156997

3 Winchester Drive, Pinner HA5 1DB

- 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 John Walley against the decision of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/2488/16 was refused by notice dated 19 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is to erect a conservatory to the rear of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to erect a conservatory to the rear of the property at 3 Winchester Drive, Pinner HA5 1DB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2488/16, dated 5 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: 099/88159 1 of 2, 099/88159 2 of 2 and Location Plan 1:1250.

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. Winchester Drive is a residential street which is suburban in character. The area as a whole is a largely intact and high quality example of classic Metro-land architecture and urban design. The houses in the area are predominantly detached, two-storey with hipped roofs. The houses are constructed from a combination of brick and render, with many retaining their original timber fenestration, including mock timber shutters. The majority of the properties have private off street parking and generous rear gardens. The space between the dwellings, materials, fenestration and prominent hipped roofs contribute to character and appearance of the area.
 4. Number 3 is a two-storey hipped roof property finished in render with front and rear gardens. The property already has a single storey rear extension; the appellant has proposed to erect a conservatory at the rear of the extension.
-

Character and appearance

5. The Council considers the proposed extension would be a piecemeal and ad-hoc form of development due to its siting and design that would diminish the character of the host dwelling and the area. However, the conservatory's design and lightweight glazed construction with dark coloured glazing bars would not be unduly prominent when viewed against the back cloth of the existing extension with its brick built elevations and tiled roof. Moreover, the domestic scale of the proposal would not materially detract from the distinguishing features and overall appearance of the host dwelling due to its size and lightweight construction. As such the proposal would be subordinate to the host dwelling and therefore would not result in material harm to its character and appearance.
6. The proposed conservatory would be sited to the rear of the property and at a lower level to Rochester Drive, screened by intervening fences/trees/hedges. Accordingly, the bulk, mass, and roof would be largely obscured from the street scene with only limited glimpses afforded from Rochester Drive. Therefore the proposed conservatory would not appear incongruous or have an adverse impact on the suburban (Metro-land) character and appearance of the area.
7. I consequently find that the proposed conservatory to the rear of the property would not result in material harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or the area, due to the proposal being of a domestic scale and design and sited so as to ensure that it would not disrupt the streetscape. The proposal 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).

Conclusion and Conditions

8. 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. Moreover, it is not necessary to apply a condition to secure a solid/obscure glazed wall on the western flank of the proposed conservatory adjacent to the neighbour at No. 1 Winchester Drive; given the separation and intervening boundary fence that ensure adequate privacy would be maintained.
9. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Jameson Bridgwater

INSPECTOR