



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2022

by V Simpson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3295317

78 Birchmead Avenue, Pinner HA5 2BH

- 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. Iyer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/4815/21, dated 7 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension; external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension; external alterations at 78 Birchmead Avenue, Pinner, HA5 2BH, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/4815/21, dated 7 December 2021, and the plans submitted with it, 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: 2021176.PA.101/revP01, Existing & Proposed Elevations/rev P01 and Existing & Proposed Floor Plans/rev P01.
 - 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.

Preliminary Matters

2. While different to that on the application form, I have taken the description of development stated upon both the appeal form and the decision notice as it is a more accurate reflection of the development proposals.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a 2-storey detached house located at the end of a cul-de-sac within a suburban residential street comprising predominantly detached houses. Whilst there is a relatively regular rhythm to the properties in the street

within which the appeal site is located, there is some variety in the scale, orientation and appearance of houses within the area. Several, including numbers 64 and 65 Birchmead Avenue appear to have been subject of previous extension 2 storey side extensions. These and other extensions within the wider area have assimilated into the street scene without harm.

5. The extension would not be subordinate to the existing dwelling in terms of ridge height or set back from the front building line of the original dwelling. However, it would have matching materials, a width equal to the existing single storey side extension, and it would be set behind the ground floor lean to roof to the front of the house. As such it would not be incongruous or obtrusive in relation to either the host dwelling or the wider street scene.
6. The separation distances between houses within the street are generally relatively small in relation to the sizes of the buildings. However, many of the gaps afford views of trees and gardens to the rear of the properties, adding to the quality and distinctiveness of the local environment. Whilst the extension would be closer to the side boundary of the site than the SPD requires, given the orientation and location of the development in relation to number 76 Birchmead Avenue, there would be no terracing effect, and a distinctive 'green gap' between the properties would be retained.
7. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with the requirements of Policy D3 of the London Plan, Core Policy CS1 of the Harrow Council Core Strategy or Policy DM1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies Local Plan, which seek to ensure that development proposals reinforce the positive attributes of local distinctiveness. Whilst there would be technical breaches of the SPD, it would accord with the aim of the SPD that extensions should harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building and the character of the area. It would also comply with the National Planning Policy Framework where it seeks good design sympathetic to the local area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above and having regard to the development plan as a whole and other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

V Simpson

INSPECTOR