
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2017

by Mike Worden BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16th August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/3174274

3 Bulmer Gardens, Harrow HA3 0PA

- 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 and Mrs Balasingham against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref 16/5360, dated 12 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension, part single and part two storey rear extension, loft conversion and 2 front rooflights to dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to the host building and surrounding street-scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached house in a small cul-de- sac within a residential area. Bulmer Gardens comprises a mix of semi-detached style properties and detached houses including a number of the type and style of the appeal property. Several of the houses in the street have been extended or altered. The appeal property has an existing single storey side and rear extension.
4. The proposed development is to extend the house to the rear and side by creating a second storey on the existing side and rear extensions and significantly altering the size and shape of the roof to create living accommodation. A rear dormer would also be created as part of this alteration.
5. The existing side extension sits very close to the boundary with No 1 which is also a detached house. The proposed extension would be flush with the existing front elevation and not be set back. It would be set in slightly from the side extension in order that the eaves of the altered and extended roof do not hang over the boundary.
6. However, the proposed side extension would appear very close to the boundary and would significantly narrow the gap between the two houses. Whilst a

number of the houses in the cul-de-sac have ground floor extensions which are on or close to the boundary, they do not have upper floor and roof extensions which would sit next to each other so closely. This would tend to create an impression of terracing and the fact that the proposed extension would not be set back from the front building line as is advised in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 5- Altering and Extending Your Home 2002 (the SPG), means that the this effect is more pronounced when viewed along the straight cul-de-sac. This proximity at full house height, which would be created by the proposed development, is not generally found elsewhere within the cul-de-sac and I consider that it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street-scene.

7. The design of the existing roof is typical of a number of the detached houses on the street. It is a hipped style which incorporates a short ridge running away from the street such that from the street the highest part of the roof appears as a point. This style aids the impression of space between the houses. The proposed development incorporates a design which involves a much fuller and significantly larger roof and creates a flat crown at its highest point. Not only is the design different to the design of other roofs in the street and would appear out of keeping, its bulk, mass, and shape would significantly emphasize the narrowness of the gaps either side of the appeal property. I consider that the proposed roof extension would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the street-scene.
8. The extended rear roof would incorporate a dormer. The size of the proposed dormer extension is larger than the maximum which would be permitted by the guidance set out in the SPG. The dormer would not be easily visible from the street and from my site visit I could see reasonably large rear dormers along neighbouring Woodcock Hill. However, I consider that the dormer would add to the general bulk of the roof extension which I consider would be harmful to character and appearance of both the existing property and the surrounding street-scene.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to Policy DMP1 of the London Borough of Brent Local Plan Development Management Policies November 2016 (the DMP) which requires development to complement the locality through matters such as design, scale, layout and detailing. The proposed development would also be contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 which have been referred to me by the appellant. These respectively seek to ensure that development respects local character and is of good design.
10. The proposed development would also be contrary to the SPG specifically in the guidance it contains in respect of two storey side extensions and roof extensions. Although elderly, I have attached significant weight to it as its principles generally accord with more recent policy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

11. Whilst not referred to in the decision notice, the Council's delegated report states that the proposed rear extension is contrary to the 1:2 rule which is set out in the SPG and aims to protect the amenity of neighbouring residents. In its report, the Council is not clear as to whether the rear upper floor window of No 1 Bulmer Gardens closest to the appeal site is a habitable room, and I

cannot determine this from the evidence before me and my site visit. Even if it was not a habitable room though, the Council report suggests the 1:2 rule would still not be met due to the impact on the second window on the rear elevation of No 1 Bulmer Gardens.

12. However, there is a general open aspect across gardens from the rear of No 1 Bulmer Gardens given the length of its rear garden and those of Woodcock Hill which border it. This would help to reduce the impact of the rear extension on outlook or the level of light received into the habitable rooms via the windows on the rear elevation. On the basis of the evidence before me I do not consider that the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 1 Bulmer Gardens and would not conflict with Policy DMP1 of the DMP in this respect.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mike Worden

INSPECTOR