

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2017

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/17/3169947

5 Cuckoo Hill Road, Pinner HA5 1AS

- 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 Robin Paul against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/5327/16, dated 12 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor side extension, part single-two storey rear extension and loft conversion with associated internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for the erection of a first floor side extension, part single-two storey rear extension and loft conversion with associated internal alterations at 5 Cuckoo Hill Road, Pinner HA5 1AS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/5327/16, dated 12 November 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: 5CHR (01) Rev A; 5CHR (02) Rev B; 5CHR (03) Rev B; 5CHR (04) Rev B and 5CHR (05) Rev B.
 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.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey detached dwelling with single storey side additions. The property is situated within a primarily residential area comprising mainly 2-storey detached houses of varying designs and sizes, some of which have been altered, including the addition of side extensions. The dwellings are set back from the footways to the rear of front gardens which
-

are landscaped and used for parking. There are variations in the gaps between the dwellings at ground and first floor levels.

4. The proposed development includes a first floor extension above a side addition which becomes a 2-storey extension where it would project beyond the rear elevation of the property. Other elements of the appeal scheme include the erection of a single storey rear extension and dormer which would add to the bulk of the property. However, by reason of siting, they would not materially change the property's current contribution to the character and appearance of the streetscene.
5. Guidance for householder developments is contained in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: *Residential Design Guide* (SPD) and this refers to extensions not dominating the original building or the surrounding streetscape. Although cumulative the proposed extensions would be large in scale, this is a case where the resulting property would be capable of being accommodated within the plot and also assimilated within the streetscene without appearing a cramped form of development.
6. The proposed side extension would enlarge the bulk of the property when viewed from the road but would be set away from the shared boundary maintaining a gap between the proposed 2-storey flank wall and 3 Cuckoo Hill Road. The depth and massing of the proposed extension would not be particularly conspicuous because the screening effect of No. 3 would result views from the road being localised. As already noted, the other alterations to the rear of the property and would not be seen from the road.
7. By reason of scale and siting, the enlarged property would not amount to an incongruous, discordant or particularly conspicuous form of development within the varied streetscene. The general character and pattern of development comprising detached dwellings sited to the rear of front gardens and with flank walls set away from the shared boundaries would be respected. Matching the external materials would assist with the proposed side extension being assimilated into the streetscene.
8. As required by the SPD, rather than visually and physically dominating the host property, the proposed side extension would appear subordinate because of being set back from the front elevation and possessing a lower ridge height. The design of the proposed extension, particularly the pitch of the hipped roof and fenestration, would echo those of the property. The small area of crown roof associated with the proposed extension would not be a conspicuous feature from the road and would not result in an awkward visual or physical relationship with the host property.
9. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene and, as such, it would not conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan, Policy CS1 of the Core Strategy, Policy DM 1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan and the general guidance contained in the SPD. Amongst other matters these policies require development to be of high quality design which is not detrimental to local character and appearance and for extensions to respect their host buildings.

These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) core principle of securing high quality design.

Conditions

10. The Council has suggested a number of conditions in the event this appeal succeeds which have been assessed against the tests in the Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance. For reasons of proper planning and the avoidance of doubt, the proposed development should be constructed in accordance with the approved drawings. For the reasons already given, it is appropriate for a condition to be imposed requiring the external materials to match those of the existing building. Accordingly, and taking into account all other matters including the Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development, it is concluded that this appeal should be allowed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR