

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2016

by A J Mageean BA (Hons) BPI PhD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/16/3159356

3 Lincoln Close, Harrow HA2 7RJ

- 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 Narayan Ramanujan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3240/16, dated 5 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey front and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey front and rear extension at 3 Lincoln Close, Harrow HA2 7RJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/3240/16, dated 5 July 2016, 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 plan: PL/3LC/01 Rev A.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located on the western side of Lincoln Close near its junction with Lincoln Road. The Close comprises 9 pairs of semi-detached bungalows within modest sized plots. These properties are of traditional appearance, constructed from red brick and slate with hipped roofs and front gable projections. Many have been altered and extended, including the addition of rooflights and rear facing dormers, as well as rendered elevations and shallow extensions to their frontages. However, overall a degree of consistency of appearance is retained.
4. The appeal property itself has been altered, most recently with the addition of a rear extension which I understand was the subject of an application for prior approval¹. The current proposal would include an additional single storey rear

¹ P/5847/15

extension to bridge the gap between the permitted extension and the shared boundary with No 5 Lincoln Close. It would also include alterations to the frontage, with an extension of around 1m bringing forward its southern section in line with the existing gable projection. This element would match the existing eaves height and have a flat roof.

5. At the time of my site visit I noted that the proposed additional rear extension was already in place. The Council has no objection to this element of the scheme and I have no reason to take a different view.
6. Turning to the proposed front extension, the Council has concerns that this addition would be excessively deep and bulky, and as such would be at odds with the character of the area. I accept that this addition would be visible in the street scene, particularly as No 3 is in a reasonably prominent position near the start of the Close.
7. Whilst this proposal would alter the front building line and therefore the prominence of the existing gable projection, this distinctive gable element would nevertheless remain visible. The flat roof would align with the existing eaves level, and a window of the same design and position to that existing would be included. Both these elements would assist in the assimilation of this narrow extension within the street scene.
8. It is relevant to note that two existing properties have similar front additions to that proposed which the Council states have been constructed without the benefit of planning permission. However, my view is that small scale alterations such as these do not impact on the overall form and appearance of these dwellings to an unreasonable degree. When viewed in this context the modest front extension proposed would not appear out of place.
9. Therefore, I conclude that this proposal would not have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area. In this respect it would comply with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan 2016, Policy CS 1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM 1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013 and the Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guide 2010, all of which require a high standard of design which respects local character.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should succeed and planning permission is granted, subject to conditions that are necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have not included a materials condition as the appellant has indicated an intention to white render the elevations of this property.

AJ Mageean

INSPECTOR