



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2019

by John Dowsett MA DipURP DipUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3232419
196 Whittington Way, Pinner, HA5 5JY

- 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 Rashmin Shet against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/1442/19, dated 16 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single and two storey front extension incorporating front porch; single storey rear extension; external alterations; (demolition of conservatory and rear extension).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single and two storey front extension incorporating front porch; single storey rear extension; external alterations; (demolition of conservatory and rear extension) at 196 Whittington Way, Pinner, HA5 5JY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/1442/19, dated 16 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: Location Plan; DNT/196 WW/P/01; DNT/196 WW/P/02; DNT/196 WW/P/03 A; DNT/196 WW/P/04 A; DNT/196 WW/P/05; except in respect of the extension to the first floor rear dormer shown on plans DNT/196 WW/P/03 A and DNT/196 WW/P/04 A.
 - 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.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no windows or doors, other than those shown on the approved plans shall be installed in the flank elevations of the development hereby permitted without the prior permission in writing of the local planning authority.

Procedural matter

2. The planning application form described the proposed development as a "Proposed single storey front extension of porch, converting garage into a study, extension to existing study at first floor in front with alterations to roof and extension of single storey extension at rear". The application form noted that the single storey front extension and conversion of the garage to a study were previously approved as part of a planning permission referenced P/4424/18 granted on 27 November 2018. The decision notice issued by the Council uses the description "Single and two storey front extension incorporating front porch; single storey rear extension; external alterations; (demolition of conservatory and rear extension)". Whilst there is nothing that would indicate that this revised description was agreed with the appellant, I note that the appellant has used this on both the appeal form and within his statement of case. Notwithstanding any previous planning permissions, the appeal stands to be determined based on the information provided on the application form and submitted drawings. The submitted drawings clearly show the existing single storey rear projection containing a bathroom and an existing conservatory being removed and replaced by a larger rear extension. In this respect the description used by the Council more accurately sets out the development that is proposed. I have, therefore, also used this for the purposes of the appeal.
3. In addition to these works, the submitted drawings also show an extension to the existing dormer window on the rear roof slope of the appeal building. This is not mentioned on the planning application form, nor is it mentioned in the appellant's statement. I have, therefore, not considered this as part of the appeal proposal. The Council suggest that a small extension shown to the side of the house which would enclose an existing covered walk to the side elevation of the house is similarly not part of the proposals. The submitted drawings clearly show that this is part of, and contiguous with, the proposed porch and study extension. I also note that the appellant makes specific mention of this in the description of the appeal proposal in his statement. Due to its physical configuration, this element would fall within the scope of both the original and amended descriptions of the proposal. Consequently, I have included consideration of this within the extent of the appeal proposal and determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 (the London Plan) seeks to ensure that new development is of a high standard of design that has regard to the pattern and grain of the existing spaces and streets in terms of orientation, scale, proportion and mass, and uses details and materials that complement, but do not necessarily replicate, the local architectural character. Policy CS1B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012 (the Core Strategy), requires that new development reinforces local distinctiveness and that extensions should respect their host buildings. Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies 2013 (DMP) expects, amongst other matters, new development to be of a high standard of design that has regard to its context.

6. Further, more detailed, guidance on extensions is set out in the Harrow Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (the SPD), which is to be read alongside the more general design policies in the development plan.
7. The appeal building is one half of a pair of two storey, semi-detached, houses. The front elevation of the house has a two storey projecting bay window, paired with that on the adjoining property, under a hipped roof, the side slopes of which run down to just above the ground floor, creating a partially gabled front elevation. The hipped roof runs back to an asymmetric pitched roof with lower eaves at the front than at the rear. The rear roof slope accommodates a flat roofed dormer window. There are many examples of this house design on Church Avenue to the south of the appeal site and the streets leading off it.
8. The house is set back from the main carriageway on a short loop of road and forms part of a small group with numbers 190 to 198 Whittington Way and 489 and 491 Rayners Lane, comprised of two pairs of semi-detached houses and three detached houses. 190 to 198 Whittington Way share a similar design and 489 and 491 Rayners Lane are of a different design, although similar to each other. Opposite the appeal building is a small area of open space adjacent to a group of semi-detached bungalows on Ladbroke Close. West of the appeal site, an area of allotments fronted by a group of large, mature, trees visually separates the appeal building and its neighbours from the next group of houses. To the east Rayners Lane consists of a mix of semi-detached and detached houses in a range of designs.
9. Other houses within the group containing the appeal building have been altered, including number 190, which has an essentially similar extension to the appeal proposal. Number 198 has also been extensively altered. My attention has been drawn to several other extensions to similar house types in the area and I was able to see these when I visited the site. Whilst there are a large number of houses of a similar design to the appeal building in the area, I saw that many of these have been extended over time, some more sympathetically than others. Whilst I do not have the full details of these other examples, they are, nonetheless, part of the established character of the area. I also observed that on those houses which have been extended to the front at first floor level, the central feature containing the paired bay windows and its associated hipped roof with overhanging eaves remained visually prominent.
10. The appeal proposal would result in the formation of an area of flat, or crown, roof which Council say is not characteristic of the area. A similar approach to the appeal proposal including a crown roof has been taken at number 190. I was able to view this property and the flat roofed element was, however, not obvious when viewed from the street.
11. The appeal building is not listed, nor is it located within a conservation area. Whilst the appeal proposal would alter the appearance of the area, change is not necessarily synonymous with harm. The appeal proposal retains the visual prominence of the projecting bay windows and hipped roof that is central to the pair of houses and, whilst it would alter the front roof slope, this approach is common to other extensions to similar house types in the area.
12. The SPD expects front extensions to reflect and complement the scale, design, quality and pattern of development in the surrounding street scene; relate to and complement the existing architectural design and materials of the existing

building; and not project significantly forward of front bay windows. Within the context of the surrounding area, I do not find any conflict with these requirements of the SPD.

13. The Council have not raised any objections to the proposed ground floor front extension. This is relatively modest in scale and would not project beyond the existing main front building line. Although the Council did not consider that the element that gives access to the covered walkway at the side of the house was within the scope of the planning application this, likewise, does not project beyond the main front building line. I saw during my site visit that the other houses in this group and many others nearby had small side additions of varying designs and, due to its small scale and integration with the proposed porch and study extension, this element would have little effect on either the appearance of the appeal building or the surrounding area.
14. The Council have also not raised any concerns in respect of the proposed rear extension. This would be located alongside a similar extension to the rear of the adjoining dwelling. From what I have read and from what I saw when I visited the site, I have no reason to reach a different conclusion regarding this element of the proposal.
15. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would comply with the relevant requirements of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Core Strategy Policy CS1B, Policy DM1 of the DMP and the guidance in the SPD.

Other matters

16. I have had regard to the representations made by the neighbouring occupier at 198 Whittington Way. These seek reassurance that the appeal proposal will not affect the foundations their house, and that the rear extension will not result in loss of sunlight/daylight or have windows overlooking their property. Due to the height of the rear extension, its distance from the neighbouring property, and the relative positions of the two houses, any effect that the proposed rear extension would have in terms of sunlight or daylight would be minimal. The submitted drawings do not show any windows in the side elevation facing number 198. I also note that the Council have not raised any concerns regarding these matters. In respect of matters arising from the construction of the proposed extensions, these would fall under the remit of Building Control.

Conditions

17. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council. In order to provide certainty regarding what has been granted planning permission, I have attached a condition specifying the approved drawings and setting out any elements to which this planning permission does not apply. In the interests of the appearance of the building and the surrounding area, it is also necessary to impose a condition requiring the use of external materials that match those of the existing building. The Council have also suggested a condition preventing the formation of further windows or doors in the side elevations of the proposed extensions, over and above those shown on the submitted drawings. Whilst there are presently no first floor windows in the side elevation of the neighbouring property at number 198 Whittington Way, this may not remain the case. Additional openings on the side elevation of the ground floor rear

extension could result in overlooking of the rear of the neighbouring house, due to the extent of its projection. I am therefore satisfied that this condition is necessary.

Conclusion

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

John Dowsett

INSPECTOR