



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 March 2019

by J Alderman BA(Hons) MA MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/18/3217742

Hill House, Brookshill Drive, Harrow HA3 6SB

- 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 A Maini against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3067/18 dated 11 July 2018, was refused by notice dated 18 September 2018.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and internal alterations to rear lounge roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and internal alterations to rear lounge roof at Hill House, Brookshill Drive, Harrow HA3 6SB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/3067/18, dated 11 July 2018, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site plan, Heritage Statement, PL-01, PL-02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The rooflights to the extension hereby approved shall be flush with the roof slope.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - (a) Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies; and
 - (b) Whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Brookshill Drive and Grimsdyke Estate Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

Whether inappropriate development within the Green Belt

3. The appeal site is situated in the Green Belt land. It is surrounded by fields and woodland and lies to the south of Harrow Weald Common.
4. The proposed development would be a single storey addition, which would extend out from the current rear building line. It would form an L shape adjoining an existing extension.
5. The parties broadly agree that the increase to the footprint of the original building as first built would be an addition of between 34% and 36%. The existing extension, including the outbuilding adds about 26% of this footprint whilst the proposed development would add approximately a further 10%. Cumulatively these additions would increase the size of the property by just over a third.
6. When considering proposals affecting the Green Belt, Paragraph 145 of the Framework states that Local Authorities should regard the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt as inappropriate, apart from specifically identified exceptions. This includes the extension or alteration of a building, provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building (paragraph 145c). An original building is defined within the Glossary to the Framework as a building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or, if constructed after 1 July 1948, as it was built originally. In the case of the appeal property it is understood it was constructed after 1948 and therefore, despite it having been extended, the original size of the building as first built forms the basis for this assessment.
7. Neither the Framework nor the development plan provide a definition of what constitutes a disproportionate addition to an original building. In coming to my conclusion I have relied up on the position broadly agreed between the Council and the appellant with regard to the increase in the footprint of the original building.
8. The host dwelling is a substantial detached property able to accommodate an additional extension as shown by the extension currently in situ, albeit that this is of a smaller scale than the proposed development. The increase in the overall size of the original building in terms of the volume, external dimensions and floorspace as proposed by the new development would be successfully incorporated in to the main dwelling without appearing overly large. The height of the proposed development would not appear disproportionate as it is at single storey with the rest of the building being mainly two storey.
9. The original building sits within a generous plot and within this context the proposed addition to the existing building would not be out of proportion either with the original building or its immediate surroundings.
10. As a result I do not consider that the proposal, when considered in combination with the previous additions to the original building, would result in a disproportionate addition. Therefore I conclude that it would be not inappropriate development within the Green Belt.
11. Consequently the proposal complies with Policy 7.16B of the London Plan 2016, which addresses the appropriateness of development in the Green Belt. It also

accords with Policy CS1 section F of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012 (CS) which seeks to protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development.

12. Finally it has regard to the requirements within Policy DM16 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013 (LP) in relation to the Green Belt and is in compliance with paragraph 145c of the Framework.
13. The Council, in their decision notice, has referred to London Plan Policy 7.4B of the London Plan. However, that does not specifically reference Green Belt land. Similarly CS Policy CS1 and LP Policy DM1 are concerned with local character and design and layout considerations and are therefore not directly relevant to development within the Green Belt.

Character and appearance

14. Brookshill Drive is an unsurfaced gravel road and is characterised by a mixture of dwelling types. In the immediate vicinity of the appeal site there are large detached houses in substantial plots with mature trees and hedgerows. The properties mainly have pitched roofs, but beyond that there is no particular consistent architectural form.
15. The appeal site comprises a two storey detached dwelling, built in the 1980s, it is of mock Tudor style, with its elevations at ground floor level being of red brick. At first floor level it is characterised by black and white Tudor style timber. It is set in a substantial plot with an integral garage and parking at the front of the property. At the rear of the property there is a large patio and a single storey red brick extension built some years ago. This extends considerably beyond the original rear building line. It has the effect of enclosing the patio area.
16. Brookshill Drive is in the Brookshill Drive and Grimsdyke CA. The CA is made up of two distinct areas of which Brookshill Drive is one. The character of the CA appears to relate to high architectural quality/historic interest within a rural setting, with the low density of development and plentiful surrounding landscaping and greenery.
17. The CA appraisal states that the 20th century buildings incorporated within the CA are "noticeably modern and are therefore considered to be of neutral character, neither found to detract from, nor to enhance, the conservation area".
18. The Council are concerned regarding the effect of the crown roof style of the proposed development, particularly in relation to the existing pitched roof single storey extension. Although a crown roof can be a complicated and awkward feature, in this instance it has been thoughtfully designed and would effectively blend the proposed development with the host dwelling. It would not result in an unduly bulky addition.
19. It is proposed that materials matching those of the host dwelling would be used. This would assist in blending the proposed extension into the existing dwelling. A modest portion of half-timbered detailing from the existing dwelling would be removed, but the majority would remain. The view of the rear of the property and overall impression of the "mock Tudor revival arts and craft" style would still be retained.

20. Overall the style of the proposed development would be in keeping with the design of the existing 20th century dwellings within the CA and would not appear out of place. In this context, the relatively small, concealed addition to the dwelling would have neutral effect on the spacious, rural quality of the CA and as a consequence its character and appearance would be preserved.
21. The Council have expressed concern regarding the number of proposed roof lights in the west elevation of the roof of the existing extension. However, there would be only two in total in this elevation and as long as they were flush with the existing roofline this would not be excessive and would not cause harm to the surrounding area.
22. As such it would comply with London Plan policies 7.4B and 7.6B which, amongst other things, require developments to be of high quality architectural design. It also meets the requirements of London Plan policies 7.8C which are concerned with heritage assets.
23. It accords with CS policies CS1B and CS1D in that it would respond positively to the local area. It also accords with LP policies DM1 and DM7 as it would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area nor fail to conserve the historic setting. Finally it would also reflect the guidance in the adopted Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010) and Brookshill Drive and Grimsdyke Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy, the latter requiring extensions to respect and complement existing buildings.

Conclusion

24. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

25. In addition to the standard implementation condition it is necessary in the interests of precision, to define the plans with which the scheme should accord.
26. A condition concerning external materials is required in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
27. Condition relating to the rooflights is required to ensure that this detailing reflects the character and appearance of the area.

J Alderman

INSPECTOR