
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2016

by Rachel Walmsley BSc MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/16/3157288
53 Axholme Avenue, Edgware HA8 5BD

- 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 Naran Ramji against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/1917/16, dated 24 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is retrospective planning application for the erection of rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of rear extension at 53 Axholme Avenue, Edgware, HA8 5BD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/1917/16 dated 24 April 2016, subject to the following condition:
 - i) the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved plans: pre-existing first floor plan_HA8 5BD; pre-existing front elevation_HA8 5BD; pre-existing ground floor plan_HA8 5BD; pre-existing loft plan_HA8 5BD Revision 01-WIP; pre-existing first floor plan_HA8 5BD; pre-existing rear elevation_HA8 5BD; pre-existing roof plan_HA8 5BD Revision 01-WIP; pre-existing section_AA_HA8 5BD; pre-existing section_BB_HA8 5BD; pre-existing side_01_elevation_HA8 5BD; and pre-existing side_02_elevation_HA8 5BD.

Procedural matter

2. At the time of my site visit, the development proposed existed on site. I have based my decision on what I saw on site, together with the submitted plans and details.

Main Issues

3. These are:
 - (i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; and,
 - (ii) the effect of the proposal in the living conditions of the occupiers of No 51a Axholme Avenue, with particular regard to outlook and sunlight.
-

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of the London Plan¹, Policy CS1B of the Core Strategy² and Policy DM1 of the Local Plan³ seek to ensure that development has regard to the existing form and pattern of development, responds positively to local context and is not detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. The SPD⁴ provides more detailed design guidance on house extensions, seeking to ensure that extensions harmonise with the scale and architectural style of existing buildings and the character of the area.
5. The rear extension at the appeal site is large in scale, extending across the full width of the existing house and a distance into the rear garden. Whilst, the extension would, on first evaluation, be contrary to the 3 metres in length recommended within the SPD, the SPD also suggests that extensions of a greater depth may be allowed in stated circumstances. These include where the extension would be sited away from an adjacent side boundary and where a neighbouring dwelling has a deeper extension. The extension is set away from the shared boundary with its unattached neighbour, No 51a Axholme Avenue. The extension is not set away from the boundary with No 55 Axholme Avenue, however, it complements the depth and height of the rear extension at this property and as a result is not out of keeping in design or scale.
6. I recognise that the overall footprint of the extension represents a disproportionate addition to the host dwelling. However, the extension is in-keeping with the overall form of the host dwelling; the rectangular form of the extension complements the form of the house and the shape of its roof. Furthermore, many properties in the area have been extended and had alterations to their roofs. In light of this, I do not find a prevalent pattern of development or architectural style which should determine the form and scale of the proposal. Together with the position of the extension to the rear of the appeal site and out of public view, I find that whilst the extension is disproportionate in size, it does not have a discernible effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area to be considered harmful.
7. In all, therefore, I find that the development is not contrary to Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of the London Plan, Policy CS1B of the Core Strategy, Policy DM1 of the Local Plan or the SPD.

Living conditions

8. No 51a Axholme Road has a single storey rear extension that extends across the full width of the property and is fully glazed, offering wide views down the garden of the property. The extension at the appeal site extends beyond the depth of the extension at No 51a and above the fence on the shared boundary. The extension is therefore visible from within the living space of the rear extension at No 51a. However, the extension is also set away from the shared boundary and therefore does not dominate the outlook from the living space at No 51a. Furthermore, given the width of the extension at No 51a and the wide

¹ The London Plan (March 2015)

² Harrow Core Strategy (February 2012)

³ Harrow Council Development Management Policies (July 2013)

⁴ Residential Design Guide (15 December 2010)

views that this affords, the proposed extension does not have a discernible effect on the outlook from No 51a to create oppressive living conditions for its occupants.

9. The SPD advises that extensions should not cause any unreasonable loss of light or overshadowing to any habitable rooms in neighbouring properties. The extension is to the north of 51a and therefore is not within the sun's path as it travels from east to west. As such the extension does not impact on the levels of sunlight into the living spaces at No 51a.
10. In all, therefore, I find that the development is not contrary to Policy 7.6B of the London Plan or DM1 of the Local Plan which seek development that does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding occupiers.

Conditions

11. The Council has not suggested any planning conditions. In light of the development already existing on site, a plans condition is necessary to ensure that the development remains in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the development is not contrary to the development plan and therefore the appeal is allowed.

R Walmsley

INSPECTOR