

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2016

**by Jameson Bridgwater DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/16/3155181**

**68 Butler Road, Harrow HA1 4DR**

- 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 Ms Christelle Brewster against the decision of the London Borough of Harrow.
  - The application Ref P/1907/16 was refused by notice dated 7 July 2016.
  - The development proposed is described as 'erection of a single storey wraparound extension on the ground floor terraced house'.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side to rear extension at 68 Butler Road, Harrow HA1 4DR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/1907/16, dated 19 April 2016, 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: PP-05 rev A, PP-07, PP-08 rev A, PP-10 rev A and PP-11 rev A.
  - 3) The external materials to be used in the development hereby permitted shall match in colour, form and texture those of the existing building.

### Procedural matters

2. The description of development was amended by the Council at the application stage to refer to '*single storey side to rear extension*'. I agree that this more accurately describes the proposed development and this is the description I have therefore used in my decision.

### Main issues

3. The main issues in the appeal are:
    - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the host dwelling and street scene; and
    - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 66 Butler Road (No 66), with particular regard to outlook.
-

## **Reasons**

4. Butler Road is a residential street which is suburban in character. The houses in the area are predominantly terraced or semi-detached and two-storey. The houses are constructed from a variety of materials, but in the main, brick and render, with many retaining their original timber fenestration. The majority of the properties have long narrow rear gardens. Number 69 is a two-storey end of terrace property finished in render with a side access to the rear garden.

### *Character and appearance*

5. The subordinate and simple design of the proposed extension respects and relates to the architectural style of the host dwelling. Moreover, the bulk, length, and height of the proposed extension are consistent with other extensions/conservatories in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. As such, the proposed extension would not be an incongruous or unsympathetic addition to the original dwellinghouse and would not result in harm to the character of the host dwelling or the area.
6. Having reached the conclusion above, the proposed single storey rear extension is therefore consistent with Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy, Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan. In reaching my conclusions I have also taken into account the Harrow Residential Design Guide SPD (2010).

### *Living Conditions*

7. The modest scale of the proposed development, the adequate separation distance and intervening close boarded boundary fence between the proposal and No 66, would ensure that the proposed single storey extension would not result in an unneighbourly or overbearing impact on the outlook of occupiers of No 66. Furthermore, due to the orientation and the limited size and position of the extension in relation to the two storey flank elevation of the host dwelling, it would not appreciably reduce the level of sunlight/daylight reaching No 66 or result in a material increase in overshadowing.
8. Having reached the conclusion above, the proposed single storey rear extension is therefore consistent with Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan and Policy 7.6 of the London Plan. In reaching my conclusions I have also taken into account the Harrow Residential Design Guide SPD (2010).

## **Conditions and conclusion**

9. In addition to the standard implementation condition, it is necessary for the avoidance of doubt, to define the plans with which the scheme should accord. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the scheme it is necessary for a condition to ensure the external materials match those of the host building.
10. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Jameson Bridgwater*

INSPECTOR