



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2017

by R A Exton Dip URP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/17/3173321

16 Northwick Park Road, Harrow, London HA1 2NU

- 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 Seva Care (Day Services) Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/5430/16, dated 18 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as proposed larger conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for the erection of a conservatory at 16 Northwick Park Road, Harrow, London HA1 2NU, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P/5430/16, dated 18 November 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: Drawing Nos 8690/P/01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06 and 07 all dated March 2016.
 - 3) The external materials to be used on the development hereby permitted shall match in colour, size and texture those of the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. There was no conservatory on site at the time of my site visit and so I have amended the description of development accordingly. As part of the appeal submission the appellant has undertaken to amend the proposal to a flat roofed design and submitted plans to reflect this. I have found the proposal acceptable in the form it was submitted to and determined by the Council. This is reflected in condition No2 specifying the approved plans. Consequently I have not considered the amended plans.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located in a mainly residential area. It is most closely related to dwellings along the north eastern side of Northwick Park Road. This is characterised by detached and semi-detached dwellings situated in large plots and set back from the road along a well-defined building line. No 16 Northwick Park Road has a wider frontage but similar depth to many of its neighbours, resulting in an overall larger plot. The host building almost completely fills the width of the site, negating any views through to the rear garden from Northwick Park Road.
5. To the side and rear of the appeal site, along Manor Road, the appearance is different. A bungalow and 3 storey block of flats are the two closest neighbouring buildings to the appeal site, giving rise to a more varied appearance. There are limited views of the rear garden of No 16 from Manor Road, over the gardens to No 14 Northwick Park Road and No 1b Manor Road. These views are filtered by boundary treatments and vegetation. The area of the appeal proposal is less visible due to its location behind the rear projections to No 16.
6. The Council refers to its Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide 2010 (the SPD). However, the introduction to the SPD makes clear that it applies to residential development. Based on the evidence before me and my site visit it is clear that the appeal site is used as a day care centre and is not in residential use. Moreover, although the proposal would exceed the SPD's recommended 3m depth for single storey rear extensions set out in paragraph 6.59 this relates to the need for planning permission rather than the consideration of proposals. In these circumstances the SPD does not appear to be particularly relevant on this occasion. Nevertheless, due to the Council's reference to the SPD I shall still have regard to its general design aims when considering rear extensions.
7. The proposal would not be visible from Northwick Park Road and so would have no effect on the character and appearance of the street scene. In addition, whilst there would be limited views of the proposal from Manor Road, these would be in the context of varied forms of development. Consequently, the proposal would not appear incongruous or out of character when viewed from Manor Road.
8. In terms of scale, in conjunction with previous extensions, the proposal would create a substantial footprint for the resulting building. However, due to No 16's large plot it would still retain a significant garden area. Taking account of this and the limited public views of the proposal, I consider that it would not appear disproportionate to the host building within the context of the surrounding area.
9. Also, other dwellings along Northwick Park Road, including No 18 next door, have had rear extensions, some of which project out further than would the appeal proposal. Within this context, the appeal scheme would not be uncharacteristic of the pattern of development in the surrounding area.
10. Overall, I consider that the proposal would not form a disproportionate addition that would be out of character with the host building or the surrounding area. It would therefore not conflict with Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of the adopted London Plan 2016, Policy CS1B of the adopted Harrow Core Strategy 2012,

Policy DM1 of the Harrow Local Plan Development Management Policies 2013 or the adopted SPD: residential Design guide 2010. These require new development to include a high standard of design that preserves local character.

Other Matters

11. I note the neighbouring resident's comments on maintenance of a shared boundary. This however is a private matter that should be considered away from this appeal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. I have added drawing numbers to the approved plans and documents condition to provide certainty. It is necessary that materials match the host building in order to provide a satisfactory appearance. As the elevations of the proposal are substantially glazed, I do not consider that the Council's suggested condition restricting further fenestration is necessary in safeguarding the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Richard Exton

INSPECTOR