
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2016

by B Bowker Mplan MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/16/3156663
23 Roxborough Road, Harrow HA1 1NS

- 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 Mrs Neeta Parmar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/2730/16, dated 1 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is conversion of dwellinghouse into four flats; single storey side extension; two storey rear extension; rear dormer and insertion of three rooflights in front roofslope; external alterations; associated landscaping; refuse and recycling storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the conversion of dwellinghouse into four flats; single storey side extension; two storey rear extension; rear dormer and insertion of three rooflights in front roofslope; external alterations; associated landscaping; refuse and recycling storage, at 23 Roxborough Road, Harrow HA1 1NS, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P/2730/16, dated 1 June 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 plans: DRG01 Location Plan 1:1500, DRG02 Block Plan, DRG3 Existing Ground Floor Plan, DRG04 Existing First Floor Plan, DRG05 Existing Roof Plan, DRG06 Existing Front & Rear Elevations, DRG07 Existing Side Elevation & Section, DRG08 Existing North Elevation, DRG09 Proposed North Elevation, DRG200 Proposed Ground Floor Plan, DRG201A Proposed First Floor Plan, DRG202 Proposed Second Floor Plan, DRG203 Proposed Roof Plan, DRG300 Proposed Front & Rear Elevations, DRG301 Proposed Side Elevation & Section.
 - 3) Materials used in the construction of the external wall and roof surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing property at 23 Roxborough Road.

Preliminary matter

2. The description of development used in the banner heading above is taken from the decision notice which more accurately reflects the development proposed.
-

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The previous appeal proposal¹ at the site was dismissed owing to its harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area, with particular reference to views from Greenhill Way. The insubordinate, incompatible and bulky appearance of the proposal was identified as the main source of this harm.
5. In comparison to the previous appeal, the proposed first floor rear extension element has been reduced in height and width. Consequently, the two storey extension now sits beneath the pitched roof of the main dwelling. In addition, the ground floor single storey hipped roof extension has been reduced in scale. These design alterations would give the proposal a subordinate scale and less dominant appearance when viewed alongside 23 and 25 Roxborough Road and from Greenhill Way. In addition, the proposed roofs now sit more comfortably with the existing roofs, including the two storey outrigger and the proposed flat roof dormer.
6. The single storey extension would be slightly higher than the previous appeal proposal, thus bringing it closer to the proposed first floor eaves. However, the increase in height would be marginal and less noticeable taking into account the design revisions outlined above. Views of the proposal from Roxborough Road would be glimpsed only and of a set back and subordinate single storey side extension. Consequently, the proposal would have a compatible and subordinate appearance when viewed from public vantage points to the rear and front of the site.
7. The Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document requires extensions to harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original dwelling. Based on my reasoning above, the proposal would meet this requirement.
8. Therefore I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Consequently the proposal would meet the requirements of Policy CS1.B of the Core Strategy, Policy DM1 of the Local Plan and policies 7.4B and 7.6B of The London Plan. Combined, these policies require development to have regard to the scale and mass of their host and surrounding buildings and achieve a high standard of design appropriate to its local context.

Other matters

9. Concerns regarding the proposal's effect on neighbouring living conditions with reference to privacy, outlook, loss of light and noise and disturbance are raised by neighbours. However, this was not an issue identified by the Council and previous Inspector, and I note that the proposal before me is of a reduced scale and involves similarly located windows. Also, owing to the minor scale of the proposal, the construction period would only last a short period of time.

¹ APP/M5450/W/15/3139956

10. In addition, based on the evidence before me, dismissing the appeal on the grounds of highway safety, structural stability, vehicular parking, waste and recycling and the proposal comprising apartments would not be justified. Nor would dismissing the appeal on grounds of precedent be justified as this decision would not prevent the Council refusing any future applications contrary to planning policy.
11. I note concerns regarding the effect of the proposal on property values. However, this matter can only be afforded very limited weight as it is not the purpose of the planning system to protect private interests such as property value.
12. I also appreciate that the number of planning applications submitted for development at the site has been distressing for neighbours. However, this is a matter that I can afford limited weight to in my determination of the appeal.
13. Based on the information available, it is not clear what the referenced two certificates of lawfulness decisions relating to the site to fully entail. However, as I have identified no harm in relation to the main issue, I have not pursued this matter further.

Conditions

14. Whilst the Council briefly refer to the possibility of including conditions for particular aspects of the proposal in its Delegated Report, I have not been provided with a list of suggested conditions. This aside, I have imposed conditions typically associated with this type of development. This includes a condition specifying the relevant plans in the interests of certainty. A condition relating to materials is also necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area and host building.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, and having taken all matters raised into account, I conclude the appeal should be allowed subject to the noted conditions.

B Bowker

INSPECTOR