

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2017

by Ray Wright BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 06 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/16/3164919
17 Dale Avenue, Edgware HA8 6AD

- 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 Sarah Power against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3309/16 was refused by notice dated 15 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a 'double storey rear extension to create enlarged kitchen and dining area, with additional bedroom and en-suite at first floor level.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effect on the character and appearance of the area and the effect on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a two storey, semi-detached dwelling. It has an access at the side to a rear garage.

Character and Appearance

4. The proposed two storey extension would be to the rear of the property. Views of it from the public realm would be limited to those down the shared side access way, where only the side elevation would be seen, and even here views would be limited. With its siting it would, therefore, not form a prominent feature in the wider street scene.
 5. The extension would be in clear view from the rear of nearby properties and their gardens. However, despite its significant scale, with its hipped, pitched roof and matching materials, it would have a sympathetic design which would suitably relate to the original property and would not be unduly out of keeping in this rear garden setting.
 6. I conclude the proposal would not materially harm the character and appearance of the area and in this respect it would not be contrary to the high quality design requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), Policies 7.4B or 7.6B of the London Plan (LP), Policy CS 1B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012 (CS), Policy DM 1 of the Development Management
-

Policies 2013 (DMP) or the Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Design Guide 2010 (SPD).

Living Conditions

7. One of the principles of the Framework is to seek a good standard of amenity for all existing occupiers of land and buildings. Policy 7.6B of the LP requires similar protection of adjoining buildings, particularly residential buildings, while Policy DM 1 of the DMP, and SPD set out more detailed privacy and amenity requirements.
8. As proposed the extension would provide accommodation on two floors. Due to the orientation of the properties there would be limited additional impact from the extension, in terms of overshadowing, on the adjoining property at no 19. The effect would also be limited on the dwelling at no 15 due to their different alignments, the spacing between the properties and the existing effect of the main dwellings. There is also no clear evidence of any material effect in terms of potential loss of light to either of these adjoining dwellings.
9. However, the proposed extension would project from the rear elevation of the main house by around 5 metres. The design would include a parapet wall on the boundary nearest to no 19 which would rise significantly above the existing eaves line of that property. No 19 appears largely unaltered to its rear and has not been extended. Consequently, the development would create a significant blank wall along its garden boundary. It would represent an extremely imposing feature, which would detrimentally enclose the current open area at the rear of the two properties, at both ground and first floor level. I consider that the extension, to the substantial depth and height proposed, would be excessive on this garden boundary, representing an intrusive and overbearing presence visible at close quarters from the garden and rear windows of no 19. As such, the extension, as proposed, would be severely detrimental to the outlook of these adjoining occupiers.
10. I conclude the proposal is contrary to the clear objectives of the Framework, Policy 7.6B of the LP, Policy DM 1 of the DMP and SPD.

Conclusion

11. I have found that the proposal would not unduly harm the character or appearance of the area. However, this does not negate or outweigh my concerns regarding the effect on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ray Wright

INSPECTOR