
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 May 2021

by Patrick Whelan BA(Hons) Dip Arch MA MSc ARB RIBA RTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3269047

1 Chiltern Road, Pinner HA5 2TD

- 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 David Silverman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 9383/APP/2020/3549, dated 2 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey ground floor rear extension (4 metres); creation of first floor; single storey infill between garage and house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey ground floor rear extension (4 metres); creation of first floor; single storey infill between garage and house, at 1 Chiltern Road, Pinner HA5 2TD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 9383/APP/2020/3549, dated 2 November 2020, 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: Ocella Print; 20/2710/1 Existing; 20/2710/2 Proposed; 20/2710/3 Proposed.
 - 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) The upper-floor window in the east elevation shall be non-opening and fitted with obscured glazing to at least 1.7m above first-floor level and shall be retained so thereafter.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Given the number of 2-storey houses or chalet bungalows in this street, including its closest neighbour, No 3, changing this bungalow to a house would not be incompatible with the pattern of development in this street which includes a variety of house types, including bungalows extending to varying degrees upwards and outwards.
-

4. I acknowledge that the area of the additional storey is substantial and would be achieved by raising the walls of the bungalow. However, the main eaves of the raised roof, at around first-floor cill height, would be relatively low, and its ridge would be lower than No 3. Together with part-hips at the front and back, and the very modest size of the two dormers in its side slopes, and despite the volume within, the form of the raising would negate any appearance of bulkiness. The overall mass of the house would be in balance with its footprint and its plot, whose distinctive lateral gaps it would retain.
5. I appreciate that the part-hipped roof form is not a characteristic architectural feature in the pattern of development in this street. However, in the context of surrounding roofs which include hipped or gabled forms with ends in render, brickwork, or tile-hung, a part-hip would not appear out of place. Though the part-hip may be a new roof form in the street, it would not appear incoherent with its roofscape.
6. I can identify no harm from the proposal to the architectural character of the building, nor to the street scene, or the appearance of the area. There would be no conflict from the proposal with policy DMH12 of the Local Plan Part 2 (LP2) which concerns streets and public realm. I acknowledge that the roof of the proposal would not meet the form, height, and siting requirements of LP2 policy DMHD1 part E. However, in the particular circumstances of this site, and because of the architectural character and sensitivity of the proposal, I give this conflict with part E of the policy, with the remainder of which the proposal would comply, only limited weight.
7. It would nonetheless comply with LP2 policy DMHD11 which requires development to be designed to the highest standards and to harmonise with the local context taking into account the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures, surrounding rooflines, and architectural composition. Nor would the proposed development conflict with policy BE1 of the Local Plan Part 1 which seeks development with a high quality of design that enhances local distinctiveness in terms of layout, scale, form, and materials.

Conditions

8. In the interests of proper planning and for the avoidance of doubt, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In order to safeguard appearance, a condition requiring the extensions to be built in materials which would match the existing is necessary. To protect the privacy of the neighbours at 3 Chiltern Road, a condition to obscure-glaze and fix shut to eye level the upper-floor window which would be opposite their clear-glazed bathroom window is necessary, to protect their privacy. Given the distance of the neighbouring houses to the west, and their location in the built-up area where a degree of mutual overlooking of back gardens is commonly accepted, I see no necessity for a glazing condition to that side.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Patrick Whelan

INSPECTOR