



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 August 2020

by Conor Rafferty LLB (Hons), AIEMA, Solicitor

Decision by Kenneth Stone BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/20/3249318

32 East Towers, Pinner HA5 1TL

- 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 Balbir Singh Bassi against the decision of Harrow Council.
 - The application Ref P/5097/19, dated 9 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'retrospective planning application for retention of rear extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the retention of rear extension at 32 East Towers, Pinner HA5 1TL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/5097/19 dated 9 December 2019, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be retained in accordance with the following approved plans: Plans ZAAVIA/32ET/101 Rev A; and As Built Elevation ZAAVIA/32ET/103 Rev A

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. There are two outstanding appeals in connection with this site. This decision deals with the retrospective planning application for the retention of a rear extension. Appeal APP/M5450/D/20/3249333 dealing with the retrospective planning application for the retention of a rear dormer is the subject of a separate appeal decision.

Preliminary Matters

4. The development plan includes the Harrow Council Core Strategy February 2012 (the Core Strategy), the Harrow Council Development Management Policies July 2013 (the DMP), and the London Plan Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011 March 2016 (the London Plan). In its decision the Council has relied on other documents including the emerging London Plan. I accord Policies D1 and D3 of the emerging London Plan substantial weight as

these are included in the 'intended to publish' draft of the London Plan and thus are unlikely to change.

5. The development has already been constructed. I have considered the appeal on the basis that planning permission is sought for the development that has already been carried out.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. The appeal site is located on the eastern side of East Towers in Pinner and comprises a two storey semi detached dwelling. The area is characterised by its residential nature where, on the eastern side of the street the properties retain a certain level of consistency in character, style and design along the front elevations, albeit with varying levels of alterations and additions. The appeal property benefits from an L shaped rear garden, comprised of a grass area to the side and a larger patio section directly behind the house. This patio area is made up of both stone slabs and wooden panelling. To the rear of the garden are two outbuildings, which also feature wood panelling to match the patio.
8. The development comprises an extension to the rear of the property that has already been constructed. The Harrow Council Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guide, adopted 15 December 2010 (the SPD), addresses household extensions in section six. It advises at paragraph 6.6 that extensions should harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building, and the character of the area but that in some circumstances an extension in a contrasting modern design may be acceptable. While the SPD represents guidance rather than policy, it is nonetheless a material consideration in the determination of this appeal.
9. It is acknowledged that the front elevation of the appeal property is constructed primarily from red brick, appearing as a traditional dwelling in keeping with the predominant style of East Towers. However, from the rear elevation the property is more modern in appearance with a smooth render and large glazed patio doors along the majority of the ground floor. It is in this context that the extension is experienced and, while it has been constructed in materials that do not match those of the original dwelling, the wooden panelling used is prevalent in the rear garden of the house, both on the outbuildings and the patio area. The extension therefore reads as a continuation of this style, reflecting the modern design of the property and garden when viewed from the rear. In this circumstance the contrast between materials of the extension and the house are acceptable, merging the modern style of the dwelling with the wooden panelling in the outdoor area to create an overall cohesive design aesthetic, rather than reading as a visually separate or out of place addition.
10. While the extension is linked to the host dwelling by the exterior of a stairwell, this link element is only visible from certain vantage points within the rear garden, and the lower level of the extension serves to ensure that it appears as a subservient addition to the main dwelling. Furthermore, as the proposed extension is unseen from any vantage point along East Towers and is within a suitably enclosed area to prevent it being experienced alongside other rear extensions within the locality, I

do not find it causes any significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

11. For the above reasons I find that the development would have not a significantly adverse visual effect on the character and appearance of the host building or the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would comply with Policies 7.46B and 7.6B of the London Plan, Policies D1 and D3 of the emerging London Plan, Policy CS1B of the Core Strategy, Policy DM1 of the DMP and the SPD, which seek to encourage a high level of design that maintains the character of the surrounding area.

Conditions

12. The Council have suggested conditions for materials to match and approved plans. As the application was submitted retrospectively, however, and I have accepted the materials, a materials to match condition is not necessary. In order to provide certainty I am however satisfied that a condition specifying the plans in accordance with which the proposal is to be retained is necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

C Rafferty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, the appeal is allowed.

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR