



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2022

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3285848

71 Hill Road, Pinner, HA5 1LD

- 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 Saqib Allana against the decision of the London Borough of Harrow Council.
 - The application Ref P/3484/21 dated 19 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension; single storey rear; first floor side extension; alterations and extension to roof; rear dormer; rooflights in front and side roofslopes; external alterations (demolition of attached garage).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side extension; single storey rear; first floor side extension; alterations and extension to roof; rear dormer; rooflights in in front and side roofslopes; external alterations (demolition of attached garage) at 71 Hill Road, Pinner, HA5 1LD in accordance with the terms of the application ref: P/3484/21 dated 19 August 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years, beginning with the date of this decision;
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the submitted material details and following approved plans: Location Plan (project reference pottle_71hillroad) and proposed plans drawing no. 4344/05.
 - 3) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s), other than those shown on the approved plans shall be installed in the Flank elevation(s) of the development hereby permitted without the prior permission in writing of the local planning authority;
 - 4) The window(s) in the first floor flank elevation(s) of the proposed development shall: (a) be of obscure glass, (b) be permanently fixed closed below a height of 1.7m above finished floor level, and shall thereafter be retained in that form;
 - 5) The roof area of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of further specific permission from the local planning authority.

Procedural Matters

2. I have utilised the Council's description of the development as per the decision notice as I feel it more concisely describes the development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling, visual amenity of the wider locality and streetscene.

Reasons

4. I note that both parties acknowledge and agree the presence of an existing planning permission for some elements of the proposal which is before me. The ground floor side and rear extension would remain unchanged from that already approved under permission reference P/1544/20. The Council also confirm, within their delegated report, that the rear dormer and roof lights are acceptable additions on their own merits. I have no evidence before me to conclude differently on these elements as a result of the submissions before me or my site visit. The decision notice confirms that the refusal reason is based upon the first floor side extension and alterations to the roof form. For the avoidance of doubt the appeal will focus upon this element.
5. The appeal site is a semi-detached two storey dwellinghouse with a catslide roof form to the side which currently benefits from a side dormer. At the time of my site visit I parked on Hill Road to the South East of the appeal site (towards Cannon Lane) and walked up the road. I then continued, past the appeal site, and walked further up Hill Road and into Glover Road before walking back down. I noted that the side dormer is a common feature amongst properties of the same style within the locality and that many properties in the area have differing forms of extension. I found that some of the extensions within the locality presented as quite notable, and some incongruous, within the locality. I do not find the character of the area to be as uniform as suggested within the Council's delegated report.
6. The appellant has made reference to the extensions permitted at 53 and 63 Hill Road which are a short distance from the appeal site. I find that it is clear that these two examples were originally the same house type as the appeal property and have undergone similar extensions in recent years. The extension as proposed with a new roof would provide a consistent roof form above the dwelling as a complete hipped roof. It would be consistent with the extensions that have been permitted at nearby 53 and 63 Hill Road respectively. The attached neighbours at 53 and 63 at Hill Road have not expanded in a similar manner which has evidently resulted in some imbalance to the semi-detached dwellings as a pair. Despite this I do not find that the proposal before me would be uncharacteristic within the area nor detract from the character of the area.
7. I do not find the proposal would completely subsume the original cat slide roof nor excessively alter the host dwelling from its original form. The proposal would extend the roof, replicating the same existing roof slope angle, and essentially infill above the built form already created by the side dormer with a consistent roof form. I do not find the proposal would appear unduly bulky, disproportionate or overly dominant. From the side elevation the roof form

would large appear visually unchanged as shown through comparison of the existing and proposed elevations. Although the extension would reduce the symmetry of the host dwelling and its attached neighbour due to the variance of extensions within the area, this would not appear visually intrusive or out of character to a level which would warrant refusal.

8. I note that the two examples above, at 53 and 63 Hill Road, are stated to pre-date the Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2010 (SPD). Regardless of the timings of their approval I find that they still demonstrate that this type of semi-detached property and roof type can accommodate such a proposal without detriment to the host building or visual amenity of the area. The SPD requires extensions to complement the original street character and not dominate buildings or impair their proportions or character nor impair the original street character. I note that no set back has been proposed or a setting down of the roof line, as is recommended by the SPD, but I find that in other respects, such as proportion, scale and massing the proposal would be an appropriate form of development complementing the host dwelling more so than the current side dormer. The latter may retain the original roof form but it does present as an awkward addition to the side of the property by comparison to the proposal. I am satisfied that the proposal meets the overarching objectives of the guidance contained within the SPD.
9. Overall I find the proposal would not harm the visual amenities of the wider locality and streetscene nor would it result in a disproportionate, insubordinate and incongruous addition to the original dwelling which would result in excessive alteration. The proposal would be consistent with Harrow Core Strategy 2012 Policy CS1.B which requires that extensions respect their host dwelling and do not harm the character of suburban areas. The proposal would be consistent with Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013 (LP) Policy DM1 A which requires proposals to achieve a high standard of design and not be detrimental to character, LP Policy DM1 B (a) which requires a regard for massing, bulk, scale and height, (b) detailing and roof form and (c) local character. The proposal would also be consistent with the overarching objectives of Section 12 of The National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

Conditions

10. A time condition is attached to comply with section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. A condition requiring the development to be in accordance with the approved plans and materials is required to control and define the development which is granted consent. Conditions relating to removal of permitted development rights, and details of windows, with regard to the flank elevation and restriction of use of the flat roof as a balcony or amenity area are required to protect the amenity and privacy of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be approved subject to conditions.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR