The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2017

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/16/3162557
31 East Towers, Pinner, HA5 1TN

- 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 S Chinnaswamy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
- The application Ref P/3060/16, dated 25 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 August 2016.
- The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey front extension incorporating front porch; single and two-storey side extension and single-storey rear extension (demolition of detached garage).

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single-storey front extension incorporating front porch; single and two-storey side extension and single-storey rear extension (demolition of detached garage) at 31 East Towers, Pinner, HA5 1TN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/3060/16, dated 25 June 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: Site Location Plan and Drg Nos: 1517/PP70, 1517/PP71, 1517/PP72, 1517/PP73, 1517/PP74 and 1517/PP75.

   3) 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.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description that was given on the decision notice and which was repeated on the appeal form. This closely reflects that given on the application form but reads as a better and more accurate description of the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed two-storey side extension upon the appearance of No 31 and the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling set along a wholly residential road that includes a mix of property types but with a number of repeat designs along its length. In common with many other properties along East Towers No 31 has previously been extended; in this case amounting to a hip to gable roof alteration and a large box dormer to the rear elevation.

5. The Council is concerned that the proposed two-storey side addition would unbalance the appearance of the dwelling. However, as a semi-detached pair, the original symmetrical form of the building has already been significantly altered by the existing roof addition to No 31. The side extension would be finished with a hipped roof that would lean up against the existing end gable. Nevertheless, the extension would appear clearly sub-ordinate to the existing form of the dwelling, being well recessed behind its front elevation, with a fairly narrow width and only a modest roof profile. Its finish with matching materials would ensure that overall it would appear as a reasonably well designed and proportioned addition to the existing property and one that, in my assessment, would have little further impact upon the symmetry of the building when seen within the wider street scene, the character and appearance of which would be unharmed.

6. Paragraph 6.57 of the Harrow Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), adopted December 2010, deals with previous roof extensions. It states that where a 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. It goes on to state that such developments are incompatible with the design, character, bulk and appearance of the locality. However, the SPD provides guidance only and in this instance I am satisfied that the side addition would be neither inappropriate nor incompatible with the locality. There would therefore be no conflict with the purpose of the SPD for helping to achieve a consistently high standard of design and layout in residential development in Harrow or with the aims and objectives of Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) or Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) insofar as they seek to achieve a high standard of design in all development and respect for an area's local character.

Conclusion

7. Overall, I find that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of 31 East Towers or the wider street scene. Therefore, in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan and subject to conditions specifying the relevant drawings to provide certainty and the use of materials to match the existing in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR