

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2017

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/17/3177141

7 Tilbury Close, Pinner, HA5 4QA

- 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 H Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/1425/17, dated 27 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 22 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of an existing single storey outbuilding and the erection of a first and second storey side extension, single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of an existing single storey outbuilding and the erection of a first and second storey side extension, single storey rear extension at 7 Tilbury Close, Pinner, HA5 4QA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/1425/17, dated 27 March 2017, 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: TC7-4001, 4002, 4003, 4004 & 4005.
 4. Prior to first occupation of the extensions hereby permitted the outbuilding shall be demolished.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a modern three storey almost flat roofed end of terrace home within a small gated development of generally similar style properties. The dwellings are all of pleasing design and along with the compact communal foreground space come together to form an area of established residential character and agreeable appearance. The proposal is as described above and
-

would provide primarily for additional living space, bedroom accommodation and related facilities. The single storey rear extension would be flat roofed and the two floors to be added over the existing ground floor side part of the home would be almost flat roofed and have a fenestrated style which would mirror the existing dwelling. This side part would be a large extension at over a half of the frontage width of the existing three storey home and at almost the same height.

4. The Council is concerned that, by reason of scale and massing the scheme would be unsympathetic, bulky and incongruous and would fail to respect the character and appearance of the host property and be at odds with the local development pattern. Certainly the scheme would lead to a home of significantly greater proportions than others within this gated development. However, for a number of reasons, I am not convinced that this would be harmful in visual or character terms.
5. The host property is one of two which are set with a frontage which projects forward of the main terrace and is at the end of the row; there is little scope to view the whole array from front-on and there is not total symmetry as things stand. It is already a different proposition to the others. The appeal property forms a visual end stop with an enlarged porch arrangement and it sits on a wider plot and has a single storey side extension which leads up to a side boundary with relatively open land beyond. The first and second floor extension would be large but would display a modest degree of subservience by reason of the positioning and stepping of the front elevation and its slightly lower roof level.
6. Given the pattern of development around there is not, to my mind, any reason why a scheme here should not be allowed to run up to the existing side boundary. The existing ground floor does this and so it is not a question of losing space for landscape and there is no significant proximate building alongside to create any sense of overdevelopment. Townhouses, as displayed locally, frequently fill the width of a plot. Furthermore there would not be an impact on the main rhythm of the terrace which is bold replication marked by projecting brick piers at the sides of each home; this architectural feature would remain in situ with the extension beyond it. To my mind the extension would be a suitable and successful design to provide increased internal space and make better use of this unusually wide plot without causing aesthetic harm.
7. Policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies Development Plan Document, Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, taken together and amongst other matters, call for development to be appropriately designed for its site and setting, of a suitable form and character and protective of local distinctiveness. I conclude that the appeal scheme would not run contrary to these policies which share similar *objectives* to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010), a document which cannot be expected to cover in detail every eventuality.
8. I should add that I would agree with the Council that there would be no undue impact on neighbours' amenity stemming from the appeal proposals. The single storey element of the scheme would sit comfortably alongside a similar projection at No 6 Tilbury Close whilst properties to the rear are of

sufficient separation distances not to suffer any unreasonable degree of overlooking or loss of privacy from the principal part of the planned extension works.

Conditions

9. The Council suggests the standard commencement condition along with the requirement for materials to match the existing building. I agree this latter condition would be appropriate in the interests of visual amenity. I also agree that there should be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans; to provide certainty. The demolition the existing outbuilding in the rear garden is a part of the appeal proposal and I would agree with the main parties that this is a necessary element in order to ensure that sufficient outside amenity space would be available to secure suitable living conditions. I shall apply a planning condition on this basis.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property or the locality. Accordingly the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR