

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2017

by J Dowling BA(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/16/3165104

Hill Top, Hill House Avenue, Stanmore HA7 3PG

- 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 & Mrs Shah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/4397/16, dated 14 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey rear extension, part first floor front and rear extension existing roof altered match to adjoining property with loft conversion with two rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. For the reasons that follow, I dismiss the appeal insofar as it relates to the part first floor front and rear extension existing roof altered to match adjoining property including two rear dormers. I allow the appeal however, insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension at Hill Top, Hill House Avenue, Stanmore HA7 3PG in accordance with the terms of application ref P/4397/16, dated 14 September 2016 subject to the following conditions.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans insofar as they relate to the single storey rear extension only: PL-01, PL-02, PL-03, PL-04, PL-05 and PL-06.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Hill Top is a small cul de sac of two storey detached and semi-detached properties. With the exception of the recently built Old Orchard the houses have a consistency in their appearance through the use of such features as double height bay windows and a similar palette of materials. Hill Top and the adjoining Crestholm are the only pair of semi-detached properties on the road both of which have been extensively altered and extended.
-

4. Hill Top has an existing two storey side extension which, whilst it has gable rather than a hipped roof, through the use of a cat slide roof, lower ridge line and a dormer that is set in from the edges of the roof appears as a subordinate feature to the main house. Furthermore, because the ridge of the adjoining Crestholm is higher the bulk and mass of the house and the extension step up the slope reflecting the change in levels across the site and thereby minimising the effect on the character and appearance of both the host property and the general streetscene.
5. The proposal, albeit that it would be wider, would have a similar appearance to the extensions that have been carried out at Crestholm. However, by extending the existing ridge and roof form out over the proposed extension the existing subordination and stepping up of the properties would be lost and the bulk and mass of the building would be unacceptably increased. As a result, I conclude that the proposal would be visually dominant and out of character with both the host property and the general streetscene contrary to policies 7.4B and 7.6B of the London Plan (2016) (the London Plan); policy DM 1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies (2013) (the DMP) and policy CS 1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) (the CS) and the guidance provided within the Local Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guidance (2010) (the SPD) all of which seek to ensure that new buildings and extensions relate to their setting and advocate that development which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of an area will be resisted.
6. The purposes of these policies and guidance are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks, amongst other things, to secure good quality design.
7. I note that the Council raised no objections to the proposed single storey rear extension. The extension would line through with and reflect the design and materials of an existing single storey rear extension albeit that it would have a pitched roof. Furthermore, it would be of a similar depth to the existing single storey full width rear extension on Crestholm. Consequently, I consider that the proposal would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area. As a result I conclude that this element of the scheme would be in accordance with policies 7.4B and 7.6B of the London Plan; policy DM 1 of the DMP; policy CS 1.B of the CS; the SPD and the Framework.

Conditions

8. Paragraph 206 of the Framework sets out a number of tests that conditions need to meet. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against paragraph 206 and judge that they meet these tests. In addition to the standard time limit, for clarity and in the interests of the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, a condition requiring matching external materials to be used in the construction of the rear extension has been attached. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, I have also imposed a condition requiring that the development in so far as it relates to the single storey rear extension, be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed in relation to the proposed part first floor front and rear extension existing roof altered match to adjoining property with loft conversion with two rear dormer. However, in relation to the single storey rear extension I conclude that subject to the conditions detailed at the beginning of this decision letter, this appeal should be allowed.

Jo Dowling

INSPECTOR