



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 25 May 2021

by L Douglas BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/20/3262200

30 Grove Road, Pinner HA5 5HW

- 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 Andrew Cormack against the decision of the London Borough of Harrow Council.
 - The application Ref P/1369/20, dated 20 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is "subdivision of existing building to create new dwelling with new front door & window".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the proposed subdivision of existing building to create new dwelling with new front door & window at 30 Grove Road, Pinner HA5 5HW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/1369/20, dated 20 April 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: DWL 01, DWL 02, DWL 03, DWL 04.
 - 3) Prior to the first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted, details of the proposed bicycle storage facilities shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted.
 - 4) Prior to the first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted, details of the proposed refuse storage facilities shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is one half of a pair of semi-detached houses with off-street parking to the front, in an area characterised by detached and semi-detached houses of similar size and siting. The appeal building has been extended substantially to the side to create what has been described as an annexe,

accessed from an entrance on the side elevation. It is proposed to formally separate the annex from the parent dwelling to create a new dwelling with associated alterations, including replacing windows on the front elevation with a new entrance door. The Council's only objection to the scheme relates to the new front elevation entrance door.

4. The semi-detached pair is large in comparison to many others in the vicinity and is of commensurate size to a short terrace. On account of its existing large side extension and side entrance, the appeal property already appears as two separate dwellings. The submitted details show the proposed front door would be of composite materials to match the existing front door and would not therefore detract from the existing appearance of the building. Indeed, I noted at my site visit that the other half of the semi-detached pair has two doors on its front elevation.
5. The proposed new front elevation entrance door would more obviously set the existing annex out as a separate dwelling in the street scene, but due to the overall size of the building, this would not appear out of context with its surroundings. The proposed development would not therefore cause any harm to the character or appearance of the area.
6. The proposed development would comply with Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies (2013). These require, amongst other things, development to respond positively to local context and achieve a high standard of design.

Other Matters

7. The Council's officer report refers to Policy DM26 of the Harrow Development Management Policies, but the decision notice does not identify this policy as relevant to the reason for refusal. I have not been provided with a copy of the policy, but I have found the other policies referred to in the decision notice and provided by the Council to be sufficient to assess the proposal in relation to the main issue.

Conditions

8. It is necessary to attach a condition requiring the commencement of development within three years, and it is also appropriate to attach a condition requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in the interests of clarity.
9. The Council have not provided a list of suggested conditions. As the proposal relates to the creation of a new dwelling, further details of refuse and bicycle storage facilities are required for approval prior to the first occupation of the building as a separate dwelling, as set out in the Council's officer report. This would ensure compliance with the relevant development plan policies.
10. The Council's officer report suggests a condition requiring further details of hard and soft landscaping would have been necessary in the event of planning permission being granted. Based on the information provided I do not consider it reasonable or necessary to attach such a condition, as the proposed development does not include any significant alterations to the appeal site frontage, which I saw during my site visit to be appropriately landscaped for the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the area and the appeal should succeed, subject to the conditions set out above.

L Douglas

INSPECTOR