



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2022

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28TH June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3298008

51 Blythwood Road, Pinner HA5 3QW

- 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 Ketan Vadher against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/4987/21, dated 22 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side, part single and part double storey rear, single storey front extension, 3 rooflights and a smooth white render façade.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey side, part single and part double storey rear, single storey front extension, 3 rooflights and a smooth white render façade at 51 Blythwood Road, Pinner HA5 3QW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/4987/21, dated 22 December 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: BR51-01-1001 and BR51-01-1002.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and the area; and
 - the living conditions at 53 Blythwood Road with particular regards to light, outlook and overshadowing.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The host comprises a two storey detached house with a red brick finish, which sits on a corner plot, at a crossroads. Its front elevation is set back from Blythwood Road, and its flank is set in from the tall brick boundary wall on Norman Crescent. With a few exceptions, nearby dwellings are typically in a broadly similar style, and are mostly set back from the highway on large plots, thus contributing to the area's generally cohesive and fairly spacious character.

4. The Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2010 ('SPD') sets out that extensions should harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building, and with the character of the area, and should not dominate the original building.
5. At paragraph 6.52 it sets out that on corner sites, side extensions should reflect the pattern of development in the streetscene, in particular where the character is one of openness and space on corner plots. It continues that such extensions should have a subordinate roof, and should be at least 1 metre from corner boundaries at first floor level.
6. The proposed two storey side extension would have a roof form which would reflect the style of the host and which would be set down slightly. Its first floor would also be slightly set back at the front. Consequently, it would appear appropriately subordinate to the host.
7. That extension's side face, which would be slightly articulated at first floor to the rear, would be very close to the boundary wall with Norman Crescent – and well within the minimum distance suggested by the SPD. However, the two storey flank of the similar style dwelling at 49 Blythwood Road ('No 49') directly abuts the pavement on Norman Crescent; and the appeal scheme would therefore broadly reflect that development on the opposing side of this junction. On the other side of this crossroads at 42 Blythwood Road ('No 42') is a two storey side extension abutting the highway verge.
8. The Council points out that the development at No 49 was approved in 1990 – before the adoption of the SPD. Nevertheless it, and the extension at No 42, form part of the locality's established character. In that context, whilst I support the Council's desire to maintain openness, this development in this location would not harm the character of the area.
9. Amongst other things and in general terms, Policy D3 of The London Plan 2021 ('LP'), Policy CS1 Part B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies 2013 ('HDMP') require proposals to be of a high design standard, which responds to local character and distinctiveness, and to respect the host building. The National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework') also sets out the fundamental importance of good design. For the above reasons, the scheme would not conflict with those policies, nor with the broad thrust of the advice in the SPD.

Living conditions

10. The rear face of the host property is set significantly further back into its plot compared to the rear face of 53 Blythwood Road ('No 53'). Consequently, the proposed 4 metre deep single storey extension would have a greater impact on those occupiers than if the dwellings were aligned.
11. However, it would be set in slightly from the side boundary, and would have a low, shallow pitched roof, which would significantly limit its scale and mass. The nearest ground floor room at No 53 is a kitchen served by a single rear window, but that property's main ground floor outlook is from its much larger patio doors which are much further from the boundary. The extension would be visible from there, but would be off-set well to the side, and only part of it would be above the existing timber boundary fence. The proposal would not

therefore have a significantly harmful impact on those occupiers' outlook, or cause an adverse sense of enclosure.

12. Although the appeal site lies to the south of No 53, given that the single storey extension would have a limited height and mass, on the basis of the available evidence, and having regard to No 53's layout, I am not persuaded that it would cause a significant overshadowing effect, or a harmful loss of light.
13. As the single storey rear extension would project no more than 4 metres from the host's original rear wall, in accordance with SPD paragraphs 6.59 and 6.60 no special circumstances are necessary to justify its depth; and I am satisfied that it would accord with the SPD's advice on amenity considerations.
14. Given that the proposed two storey rear extension would be much further from the boundary with No 53 compared to the single storey extension, and would be less deep, it would not break a 45 degree line drawn from their closest habitable room windows, and its impact on those occupiers would be significantly less.
15. For the above reasons, the proposal would not conflict with those parts of LP Policy D3, and HDMP Policy DM1 which require development to deliver an appropriate level of amenity having regard to matters such as outlook, light and privacy. Nor would it conflict with the Framework's stance on ensuring a high standard of amenity. The appeal will therefore be allowed.
16. Turning to the matter of conditions, and having regard to the Framework's tests, the standard time limit condition is necessary as is, in the interests of certainty, a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
17. Finally, the Council has suggested a condition requiring that the extensions be faced in materials to match those used in the existing building. However, as is clear from the description of the development, and as set out on the drawings, which are referred to in my second condition, the walls of the house would all be finished with smooth white render, and the proposed sloping roofs would be tiled. That condition is not therefore appropriate.
18. Summing up, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area, and it would not impact adjacent occupiers' living conditions to a harmful degree. Consequently, having regard to all other matters raised, including a representation by an interested party, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR