
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2017

by R W Allen B.Sc PGDip MRTPI

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

Decision date: 26 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/17/3171043

31 Church Avenue, Pinner, HA5 5JB

- 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 Dr S Beri against the decision of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/4705/16, dated 6 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is double storey rear extension and with a front dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for double storey rear extension and with a front dormer at 31 Church Avenue, Pinner, HA5 5JB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/4705/16, dated 6 September 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; P-201; P-202; P-203/A; P-204/A; P-205; P-206/A.
 - 4) The roof area of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of further specific permission from the Local Planning Authority.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The area largely comprises properties that are similar in appearance, which are two-storey semi-detached dwelling houses that feature notable catslide roofs to their sides. The Council identifies the area as having been developed as part of the 'Metroland' urban expansion; and the regularity in design is a defining feature which contributes strongly to the character and the appearance of the area. I have no reason to disagree.
-

4. The proposed extensions to the dwelling would undoubtedly alter its appearance; the rear extensions having the greater effect than the proposed dormer window to the front. However, I find that the proposed dormer window would not be significantly so large and would not be a disproportionate or insubordinate addition to the dwelling. The form and features of the original 'Metroland' design would I find remain easily identifiable and appreciable. Moreover, because of the positioning of the property, the proposed dormer window would only be readily visible when viewed directly in front of the dwelling, thus would have little overall bearing on the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposed rear extension would be visible from a gap in the street scape when viewed from Central Avenue. However, the rear elevations of both the appeal and the adjoining property are set back and aligned away from the road, and I do not find they can be considered as principle elevations in Central Avenue where the alterations as proposed would have any significant bearing on its character and appearance. The proposed rear extension is not so significantly sized to amount to an overly large or dominant addition to the dwelling. I am satisfied that it would also not unduly unbalance the pair so as to disrupt or cause any significantly harm to their appearance.
6. I therefore find that the proposed extensions to the property taken together would not cause any significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property or the area generally. It would accord with policies 7.4 B and 7.6 B of the London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011) 2016, with policy CS1 B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, and with policy DM1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies 2013, all of which require development to achieve a high standard of design. It would also accord with the relevant parts of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 2010 entitled 'Residential Design Guide' (SPD).

Conditions

7. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against paragraph 206 of the National Planning Policy Framework. I have specified the approved plans so as to provide clarity and certainty as to the scheme approved. A conditions relating to materials is necessary to ensure the appearance of the development would be satisfactory. A condition ensuring the roof area above the single-storey element of the scheme is not used as a balcony or other form of roof terrace is necessary in the interests of safeguarding the living conditions of occupiers of surrounding properties.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R Allen

INSPECTOR