



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2019

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3231535

17 Glover Road, Pinner HA5 1LQ

- 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 Eranga Gunawardena against the decision of Harrow Council.
 - The application Ref P/1414/19, dated 22 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is addition of pitched roof over existing side dormer to create loft conversion with rear dormer 17 Glover Road, Pinner, Harrow HA5 1LQ.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor side extension, alterations and extension to roof, rear dormer, roof lights in front and side roofslopes (demolition of side dormer) at 17 Glover Road, Pinner, Harrow HA5 1LQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/1414/19, dated 22 March 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 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, 17GLOVERRD-001/002/003/004/101/102/103.
 - 3) The external surface of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development given above is taken from the Council's decision notice because it more accurately describes the development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two-storey semi-detached property located within a suburban area. There is a variance of detached but predominantly semi-detached housing in the locality with differing styles of houses identified within Glover Road and the neighbouring streets. The appeal dwelling follows broadly the same design pattern as a number of other semi-detached dwellings along the south side of Glover Road. The appeal property has an original cat-slide

roof, with a large side dormer that projects below the eaves of the dwelling extending the full width of the side of the dwelling. This side dormer is a recognisable feature to many other semi-detached dwellings of this style of dwelling.

5. There are many varieties and forms of extensions visible within the area and arguably some appear as incongruous features to the host property. My attention has been drawn by the appellant to the extensions permitted at 53 and 63 Hill Road along the adjacent street, to which the appellant seeks to replicate. It is clear that these two examples were originally the same house type as the appeal property and have undergone extensions in recent years.
6. The extension as proposed with new roof would provide a consistent roof form above the dwelling as a complete hipped roof and would correspond with the extensions that have been permitted at neighbouring 53 and 63 Hill Road. Noticeably, their attached neighbours at Hill Road have not expanded in a similar vein, and an imbalance to the pairs of semi's has been created. However, this theme is commonplace within the area and although the extension would reduce the symmetry of the host dwelling and its attached neighbour of 19 Glover Road, due to the variance of extensions within the area, this would not appear visually intrusive or out of character.
7. I have taken into account the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Design Guide 2010 (SPD) requiring extensions to complement the original street character and not dominate buildings or impair the original street character. Although no set back has been proposed or a setting down of the roof line as is recommended by the SPD, in all other respects of proportion, scale and materials, the proposal would be an appropriate form of development complementing the host dwelling. The proposed rear dormer is an element of this extension and would not be a prominent feature to the roofslope in a location where others are visible, and in any case, the rear dormer is not in contention.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conform to Policy CS 1 of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012 that requires development to respond positively to local context in terms of design, siting density and spacing, amongst other matters, and Policy DM 1 of the Council's Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013 having regard to the likes of design, massing, bulk and scale. It would also be in accordance with London Plan Policies 7.4 and 7.6 which includes meeting the requirements of high quality development that has regard to matters of scale, proportion and mass, and complements the local architectural character.

Conditions

9. I have considered conditions in light of the National Planning Practice Guidance and Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition relating to the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty and one in respect of materials is reasonable in order to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

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

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR