
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2016

by Rachel Walmsley BSc MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/16/3155916
68 Church Avenue, Pinner, Harrow HA5 5JF

- 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 Mrs Gurnam Selvarajah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/1241/16, dated 15 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is front and rear first floor extension, roof alterations, modifications to porch and conversion of existing garage to habitable room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for front and rear first floor extension, roof alterations, modifications to porch and conversion of existing garage to habitable room at 68 Church Avenue, Pinner, Harrow HA5 5JF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/1241/16, dated 15 March 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - (i) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision;
 - (ii) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1601/PL/01; 1601/PL/02; 1601/PL/03; 1601/PL/04; 1601/PL/05; 1601/PL/06; 1601/PL/07; 1601/PL/08; 1601/PL/09;
 - (iii) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is within a residential area characterised by a variety of properties that front the street, not least semi-detached dwellings that have catslide roofs that are a feature of properties within the area. Notwithstanding this, several of these properties have been altered with extensions and roof alterations.
-

4. Of the development proposed, the Council raised concern for the impact the first floor extension to the front of the property would have on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and in turn, the surrounding area. The first floor front extension would alter the existing roof form. Paragraph 6.66 of the SPD¹ states that alterations to a roof should be considered carefully given the impact the roof form can have on the character of an area. Whilst the development would change the original form of the dwelling and eliminate the catslide roof, the extension would be set down from the ridge line of the host dwelling, behind its front building line and with a window to complement the design of the existing windows. In all, therefore, the first floor extension to the front of the property would be subservient in scale to, and in-keeping with the form of the host dwelling.
5. The existing property currently shares a design with its attached neighbour to create a pair of semi-detached houses. The first floor front extension would change this, creating a roof form and a front elevation that would be different to the adjoining house. However, I have found that the form and scale of the development would be in-keeping with that of the host dwelling and therefore it would not detract from the form and scale of the adjoining property.
6. I recognise that the development would create a different architectural form to that exhibited on the attached neighbouring property. However, in light of my findings for the form and scale of the proposal, the development would not undermine the form and scale of the two properties as semi-detached houses. Furthermore, in light of the alterations and extensions that have taken place on properties of a similar design within the area, the development would not have a material impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. I appreciate that other extensions should not necessarily set a precedent for similar developments, however, I have found that the form and scale of the proposal would not cause undue harm to the character and appearance of the area and therefore the matter of precedent is of limited significance.
7. In light of my observations above, I find that the development would not be contrary to policies 7.4B and 7.6B of the London Plan², Policy DM1 of the Local Plan³ nor the SPD which seek to ensure that development has regard to local context and is not detrimental to local character and appearance.

Conditions

8. The Council has suggested a number of planning conditions which I have considered against the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance.
9. In addition to the standard time limit for commencement, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans in the interests of proper planning.
10. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area I have included a condition to ensure that the proposed materials match those used on the existing building.

¹ Harrow Residential Design Guide SPD (2010)

² The London Plan (March 2015)

³ Harrow Council, Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013)

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the proposal would not be contrary to the development plan and therefore the appeal is allowed.

R Walmsley

INSPECTOR