



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2020

by S Dean MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/20/3254671

4 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 Abdur Rouff against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/0892/20, dated 7 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and part single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension and part single storey front extension at 4 Eastern Avenue, Pinner HA5 1NP in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P/0892/20, dated 7 March 2020, 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 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: 01, 04, 05, Site Location Plan.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a previously extended, semi-detached house, set in a mixed street-scene, close to a junction and a number of non-residential buildings of markedly different character and appearance. Surrounding the appeal site there are a number of other, originally similar, but now also much-altered semi-detached houses, with a mixture of materials, scale and form. These include hipped and flat-roofed extensions, some set down from the original ridge-height, and some not. Travelling along Eastern Avenue away from the junction, the character and type of the housing changes in scale, form and layout.

4. It is clear from the Officer Report that the element of the proposal which the Council finds unacceptable is the two-storey element, and in particular its hipped roof junction with the previous hip-to-gable extension.
5. There are no examples of this particular roof arrangement on extensions in the immediate setting of the appeal site, but I was directed to similar examples in other streets by the appellant. However, as noted, there is a wide variety of extensions in the street-scene. The proximity to the junction, as well as the variety of original form in Eastern Avenue means that the area around the site is not as cohesive and consistent as other nearby streets with similar house types. As a result, I do not consider that the proposal would be so different to the already mixed surroundings that it would be incompatible with or cause harm to the existing pattern of development or the character and appearance of the area.
6. I note the references from the Council to previous appeals in the area. However, each appeal is to be considered on its own merits, and without the full details of those cases and their context, there is nothing in the extracts quoted that alters my conclusions above.
7. I therefore consider that the proposal is acceptable with regard to its effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of the London Plan 2016, Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012 and Policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies 2013. These policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development is of a design and quality which has regard to the massing, pattern, grain, scale, height, character and appearance of its surroundings, and that it complements its context.
8. The proposal also accords with the guidance within the Harrow Residential Design Guide SPD which sets out the need to ensure that extensions should harmonise with the scale and style of the host building, and the character of the area.
9. In their decision, the Council have referred to Policy D2 of the Draft London Plan 2019. As this policy relates to infrastructure requirements for sustainable densities, it does not appear to be relevant to the appeal proposal, and there is nothing in the submissions of the Council that suggests otherwise.
10. Having had regard to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance I have imposed standard conditions concerning commencement (1), requiring the use of matching materials (2) and compliance with the submitted plans (3), in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the completed development.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, and planning permission granted.

S Dean

INSPECTOR