



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2020

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/20/3244742

34 Eastern Avenue, Pinner HA5 1NP

- 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 & Mrs Harding against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/4609/19, dated 3 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 January 2020.
 - The development proposed was originally described as side/rear extension in conjunction with prior approval 4m rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension; side extension with gable end (demolition of garage) at 34 Eastern Avenue, Pinner HA5 1NP, in accordance with application Ref. P/4609/19, dated 3 November 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - (1) The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
 - (2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers 34.EA.03 (Proposed plans), 34.EA.04 (Proposed elevations) and Site Plan/Block Plan Scale 1:500 dated 02.11.2019.
 - (3) The roof area of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.

Procedural Matter

2. The description on the planning application form refers to a 'prior approval 4m rear extension'. Given this refers to a separate planning process, I have used the description given on the Council's decision notice and the appeal forms for the purposes of my decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is situated within a close-knit residential area. Eastern Avenue comprises a mix of mainly two-storey and single-storey semi-detached dwellings. No 34 is a semi-detached bungalow set within a row of similar dwellings. Whilst several retain hips to their main roof slopes, some of the

bungalows within the row have been altered and now incorporate gable sided roof forms. Some also have wider front projections than others. Consequently, the row of bungalows are not of a consistent uniform design.

5. The projection of the side gable beyond the existing side wall would be relatively marginal and would give a greater sense of symmetry with the attached gable sided bungalow at No 36. The side extension would also be set back from the existing front projection. A gap would be retained between the boundary with No 32. For these reasons, the increase in width to the dwelling would not be highly perceptible and would effectively assimilate with the street scene in this particular instance.
6. I conclude that the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, the proposal would comply with the elements which seeks to protect local character of policies 7.4 (Local Character) and 7.6 (Architecture) of The London Plan (2016), Core Policy CS1 (Overarching Policy) of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM1 (Achieving a High Standard of Development) of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies (2013) and the National Planning Policy Framework.
7. In reaching this conclusion, I have also had regard to Policy D3 (Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach) of the London Plan Intend to Publish version (December 2019) and the guidance in the Harrow Council Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010) as a material consideration.

Conditions

8. The proposed elevation drawings provided confirm that all proposed materials are to match the existing dwelling. Therefore, a condition specifying this requirement is not required in this instance given the development would need to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings.
9. The Council has requested that a condition be attached preventing the roof area of the rear extension from being used as a balcony or roof garden. I consider such a condition would be reasonable to ensure that the privacy of neighbouring occupiers is protected.
10. A condition to prevent additional doors or windows from being inserted in the flank wall facing No 32 Eastern Avenue has also been suggested. The side wall of the extension would be set in from the boundary and would already incorporate side windows. The Council has not identified any harm to the living conditions of No 32 in that particular regard and, from what I saw on site, I find no reason to conclude differently. Similarly, any further windows or doors would not be likely to result in material harm. Such a condition would therefore not be reasonable or necessary.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out, the appeal is allowed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR