
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2022 by B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

Decision by H Nicholls FdA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3288860

35 Orchard Grove, Edgware HA8 5BL

- 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 Muhammad Paracha against the decision of London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3102/21, dated 26 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of two storey side extension part single storey front extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of two storey side extension part single storey front extension and single storey rear extension at 35 Orchard Grove, Edgware, HA8 5BL, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/3102/21, dated 26 July 2021, 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: Site location plan, ZAAVIA/350G/307 A, ZAAVIA/350G/301 A, ZAAVIA/350G/302 A, ZAAVIA/350G/304 A, ZAAVIA/350G/305 A.
 - 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.

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.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property, a two storey semi-detached dwelling, is located within a wider residential area and whilst numerous and various additions and

- extensions are visible, the area is characterised by properties of a similar scale, inter-war age and appearance.
5. The appeal property and its adjoining neighbour have a gable roof form, previously extended from the hipped roof found on the majority of neighbouring properties, resulting in a substantial rear roof extension.
 6. The proposed first floor side extension would be set down from the roof ridge and set back from the front wall of the house by 1m, in accordance with the guidance set out in the Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Design Guide' (2010) (SPD). In addition, its limited width means that it would therefore appear subservient to the main house.
 7. I acknowledge that there is conflict with the SPD where it sets out that where a property has been extended by the conversion of a hipped roof to a gabled roof, any further extension is inappropriate. It states that such developments are incompatible with the design and character of the locality.
 8. However, the front roof pitch would match that of the main roof as would its gabled form. Whilst the rear gabled roof element would not match the existing rear flat roof, this would limit its scale next to the substantial existing three storey rear elevation. The addition of a matching sloping roof of the single storey element at the frontage and the sloping roof of the proposed single storey rear extension would also provide some cohesiveness and tie the development in with the main house.
 9. The extension would not therefore look incongruous. Its visual impact would be insufficient to result in the extension dominating or substantially compromising the existing character of the roof and property.
 10. Moreover, there is a variety of extensions and roof additions visible in the locality, including for example next door at No 33 and at No 31, both of which have two storey side additions. Whilst I acknowledge that these developments were approved under a different policy context, they are part of the established street scene and as such, the proposed extension would not appear inappropriate and would not harm or be incompatible with the existing character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 11. The single storey rear extension is limited in scale and would not harm the character and appearance of the existing property nor surrounding area.
 12. The Council point to examples of two appeal decisions¹ in the wider area. Whilst I have not been provided with plans of this development, I note that with regards to the development at 56 and 58 Wetheral Drive, the 'linking' of the two properties through the proposed extensions was considered to be a conspicuous and discordant feature. The Inspector concluded that 'when considered as a whole', the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwellings and wider area.
 13. With regards the development at 26 Kenmore Road, I note again that, along with a two storey side, this included a front extension in addition to a flat roofed two storey rear extension. The proposed two storey extension would also have an awkward hipped roof adjoining the existing gable end.

¹ APP/M5450/D/19/3237775 & APP/M5450/D/20/3250661

14. As such, the visual impact of both examples would be significantly more apparent, and therefore neither are directly comparable to the proposal before me.
15. I conclude therefore that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the existing property nor surrounding area. There is no conflict with Policies D3.D(1) and (11) of the London Plan (2021), Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) or Policy DM1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013). These Policies collectively require development to be of high standard and appropriate in scale and design to local character.

Conditions

16. A condition specifying the time limit and approved plans is necessary as this provides certainty. I have imposed a condition specifying materials are to match the existing property in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
17. A condition removing permitted development rights with regards to the insertion of a side elevation window is not considered necessary, as any such window above ground floor level would have to be obscure glazed. This would be sufficient to safeguard the amenities of the neighbouring residents, as any ground floor windows/doors would not result in unacceptable overlooking.

Conclusion and Recommendation

18. There are no material considerations that indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore recommend that the appeal should be allowed with the above conditions.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Hollie Nicholls

INSPECTOR