

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2017

by Christa Masters MA (hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 6th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/16/3166205

35 Village Way, Pinner, HA5 5AB

- 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 Anita Jutla against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/4055/16, dated 22 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey ground floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. Whether the proposal has satisfactorily addressed the issue of flood risk.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a residential dwelling set within an established residential area. The site is also located within a critical drainage area and Flood Risk Zone 3a and 3b.
 4. Policy DM9 of the Development Management Plan (DMP) 2013 states that proposals requiring a flood risk assessment must demonstrate that the development will be resilient to all relevant sources of flooding including surface water. The policy goes on to note that proposals which fail to make appropriate provision for flood risk mitigation, or which would increase the risk or consequences of flooding, will be refused.
 5. The appellant has submitted a document entitled a flood risk assessment. This document sets out details concerning the construction of the extension such as the floor construction and electrical wiring. It fails to identify any details in relation to flood mitigation measures. The Harrow Drainage Authority have set out in detail the matters which would need to be covered including flood mitigation measures and flood displacement storage. As matters stand, this document before me does not satisfy the requirements of policy DM9 of the DMP and there is a clear policy conflict in this regard.
 6. I therefore conclude based on the limited evidence before me, I have insufficient evidence to conclude that both the development plan policy and the Framework have been satisfactorily addressed on this issue and there would be a risk to future occupiers.
 7. For these reasons, I therefore conclude the appeal should be dismissed.
-

Christa Masters

Inspector