
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2021

by Rebecca McAndrew BA Hons, PG Dip Urban Design, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3270651

34 Rowlands Avenue, Hatch End, Pinner HA5 4BH

- 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 Nishil Patel against the decision of Harrow Council.
 - The application Ref P/4704/20, dated 14 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'single storey front extension; first floor side to rear extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the single storey front extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the first floor side to rear extension
2. Planning permission is therefore granted for 'first floor side to rear extension' at 34 Rowlands Avenue, Hatch End, Pinner HA5 4BH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/4704/20, dated 14 December 2020, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and 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 shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, so far as relevant to those parts of the development hereby permitted:

Drawings A-HA-034B-SL-001 Rev 01, A-HA-034B-BP-002 Rev 01, A-HA-034B-SL-210 Rev 01, A-HA-034B-S-200 Rev 01, A-HA-034B-PL-110 Rev 01, A-HA-034B-EL-310 Rev 01, A-HA-034B-PL-100 Rev 01, A-SH-034B-EL-300 Rev 01
 - 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.

Procedural matters

3. The London Plan (2021)(LP) has been published since the appeal was made. I shall consider the appeal accordingly. In doing so I am satisfied that no injustice will be caused since the relevant policies which seek to deliver good design are essentially the same as in the previous plan.

4. In the banner heading above, I have taken the description of development from the Council's refusal notice as this accurately and precisely describes the appeal proposal.
5. The planning application sought consent for a scheme which can be divided into two distinct parts and could be implemented independently. This includes a single storey front extension and a first floor side and rear extension. The appellant's statement of case confirms that the appellant no longer challenges the refusal of planning consent for the single storey front extension, which was based on harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. In view of this, I have not considered the acceptability of the single storey front extension as part of this appeal and instead have only considered the first floor side and rear extension.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

7. Policy CS1B of The Harrow Core Strategy (2012)(CS), Policy DM1 of Harrow Council Development Management Policies (2013) (DMP), Section 6 of the Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guide (2010) (SPD) Policies D1 and D3 of the London Plan (2021) (LP) and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the framework) seek to ensure that new development is of a high quality design and reflects context. In particular, the SPD seeks to ensure that extensions remain subordinate to, and reflect the character of, the host dwelling and the character of the area.
8. This part of Rowlands Avenue includes a mixture of predominantly semi-detached house types. A large proportion of these have been extended in a variety of manners, some sharing similarities to the appeal proposal. Given that the roof of the appellant's home has been extended in the past from a hip to a gable, the proposed first floor hipped roof extension would reflect the original design of the property and other dwellings in the vicinity. The proposed extension would be set back from the front elevation and down from the ridge of the host dwelling. Therefore, when viewed from the street, it would appear subordinate to the existing dwelling and would sit comfortably in the context of the existing property and the area.
9. The proposed extension would wrap around the rear elevation of the property, which already includes a box roof dormer and a single storey full width rear extension. Whilst the proposed extension would overlap the rear corner of the existing property, a large proportion of this first floor elevation would remain intact and therefore the extension would not appear obtrusive. The fact that the hipped roof would be set down below the ridge height of the main dwelling would also ensure that the rear extension appears subordinate to the host dwelling. I note the Council's concerns that the hipped roof of the proposed extension would interrupt the existing rear dormer. However, this would partially obscure and soften views of this bulky existing box roof dormer, which would be an improvement on the current situation.
10. In view of the above, I consider the proposed first floor side to rear extension to be acceptable as it would not harm the character and appearance of the host

dwelling or the area. The proposal therefore meets the requirements of CS Policy CS1B of The Harrow Core Strategy, DMP Policy DM1 of Harrow Council Development Management Policies (2013) (DMP), Section 6 of the SPD, LP Policies D1 and D3 and paragraph 127 of the Framework.

Other matters

11. I have considered the details of a number of appeal decisions submitted by both parties in support of their cases. Based on the information before me, I recognise that there are similarities between the appeal scheme and these cases. However, each proposal must be considered on its own merit. Therefore, I attach limited weight to this matter in making my decision.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed in part and allowed in part, subject to timescale and plans conditions in the interest of certainty and a material condition in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR