



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2023

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3313145

6 Old Hall Close, Pinner, HA5 4ST

- 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 and Mrs C Palmer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3324/22, dated 20 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'first floor rear extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension and external alterations at 6 Old Hall Close, Pinner, HA5 4ST in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/3324/22, dated 20 September 2022, subject to the following conditions:-
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1845-P3A .
 - 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.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s) / door(s) shall be installed in the flank wall(s) of the development hereby permitted without the prior permission in writing of the local planning authority.

Preliminary matter

2. The Council's decision includes in its description of the development 'external alterations' and as this describes the proposal in more detail, I have considered it on this basis.

Reasons

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling. The development plan includes policy D3 D(1) and D(11) of the London Plan (2021), policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and policy DM1 of the of the Council's

Development Management Policies (2013) which together seek to ensure a high standard of design that respects the host building and the character of the area, having regard to scale, form and massing, amongst other things. National policy in the National Planning Policy Framework has a similar objective.

4. The appeal site is a large detached dwelling with a hipped roof sited on a generous plot within a leafy cul-de-sac of regularly spaced and mainly hipped roof dwellings with consistently proportioned front elevations built to varying designs. Some have been extended at the front or rear and the appellant has said that some have crown roof extensions. I have also noted that permission has recently been given for a large rear extension with a crown roof at the adjacent dwelling at no 6. However, most of those crown roofs are not clearly apparent as such in the street scene and appear as hipped roofs. Those extensions that are visible in the street scene are sympathetic to the scale, form and style of the original dwellings and retain their high quality and traditional character.
5. The appeal dwelling has already been extended significantly with a two storey extension front, side and rear extension. Although this has a crown roof, that is not clearly apparent in the street scene and it appears as a hipped roof which integrates very well with the original form and style of the house.
6. The proposed development would be sited on the rear elevation. This elevation consists of three elements, the original part of the house, a two storey extension and a single storey extension. The proposal would extend above the existing flat roofed single storey extension. It would have a crown roof with a pitch to match that of the existing roofs and would have windows that reflect those in the existing dwelling.
7. It would be only slightly greater in width than the existing two storey rear extension and approximately half the width of the existing dwelling as a whole. Its depth would be less than that of the original part of the house. The ridge would be set down significantly from both the main ridge and from the ridge of the existing extension. It would not result in an additional element on this elevation but would be read as the third element together with the existing ground floor extension. Although it would result in extensions across the full width of the original dwelling, its scale and massing would not be excessive in comparison to the existing dwelling and the original ridge and form of the dwelling would remain evident. The crown roof form would not be apparent and it would appear as a subordinate hipped roof addition. The form, scale and design would therefore reflect those of the existing house.
8. It would not be seen clearly from the street and given the high surrounding hedges of the property, would only be seen clearly from its rear garden. Nonetheless, this is a well-designed extension which respects the scale and character of the existing house.
9. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would not result in significant harm to the character or appearance of the dwelling and accords with the development plan policies referred to above and with the Council's guidance in its Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Design Guide' (2010).

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in order to provide certainty. A condition requiring matching external materials is necessary in the interests of character and appearance. The Council has suggested a further condition to restrict permitted development rights for windows or doors in the flank wall and this is necessary to safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. I have changed the description of development in the formal heading to reflect that of the Council's decision which describes the proposal more accurately.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and there are no material considerations that justify determining the appeal otherwise.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector