



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2019

by Rachael Pipkin, BA (Hons), MPhil, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3224246

4 Langland Crescent, Stanmore, HA7 1NG

- 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 Kudar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref: P/4338/18 dated 27 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2018.
 - The development proposed is described as 'retrospective application for 6.0m single storey rear double storey side/part rear as approved previous application'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single-storey front extension incorporating front porch, single and two-storey side and rear extensions (demolition of attached garage) at 4 Langland Crescent, Stanmore, HA7 1NG in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: P/4338/18 dated 27 September 2018, and plans numbered PL-01, PL-02, PL-03, PL-04 and PL-05.

Procedural Matter

2. The extensions that are the subject of this appeal have already been constructed. I have proceeded to consider the appeal on that basis.
3. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the development comprises a single-storey front extension incorporating front porch, single and two-storey side and rear extensions (demolition of attached garage). This, more accurate, description of the development was used by the Council in its decision. I have also used these words in my formal decision.
4. The proposed development is an amended scheme to a previous planning approval¹ granted permission on 1 August 2017 with the only change to the rear ground floor extension. The ground floor extension was subject to a notification under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, as amended and on 26 July 2017 it was confirmed prior approval² was not required.

¹ Ref P/2612/17

² Ref P/2948/17/PRIOR

5. The appellants have stated that the ground floor extension was constructed independently of the other extensions. Irrespective of this, the ground floor extension as built does not reflect that approved under the planning permission and materially changes the approved scheme. Therefore, notwithstanding the existing planning permission and notification relating to prior approval, the proposal before me is for the development in its entirety and I have therefore considered the scheme on that basis.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
- the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of Number 2 Langland Crescent (No 2), with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

7. Number 4 Langland Crescent (No 4) is a two-storey semi-detached house. With No. 2, which appears to be subdivided into flats, these are the only houses on this side of this section of Langland Crescent. The wider area is characterised by two-storey properties in a variety of semi-detached and terrace layouts. There is no overall consistency in development patterns within the area and it is not particularly notable in architectural or streetscape terms.
8. The proposed development has created a single-storey front porch, a two-storey side addition and part single and part two-storey rear addition. The extensions have pitched roofs apart from the rear single-storey extension that has a flat roof.
9. The rear extension at ground floor level extends some way into the rear garden along the boundary with No. 2 but not across the full width of the property as indicated in the Council's delegated report. As such, I accept this is not directly comparable to the scheme dismissed on appeal³ at No. 122. While not overly wide, the extension is a large, square and bulky addition to the house which, due to its flat roof, is inconsistent with the other extensions to the building which all have hipped roofs. The first floor extension above this is set back from the rear elevation, positioned offset from the centre of the extended property. It extends less than half the width of the extended house and is not unduly dominant.
10. These rear extensions combined have a slightly jarring appearance due to their different roof shapes. However, the ground floor rear extension is visible from a limited number of properties, some of which have also been extended. In this context, the rear extensions are not visually harmful.
11. The front and side extensions have been designed to appear subordinate to the main dwelling being set back and with small hipped roofs. In this respect they do not appear overly large or dominating in relation to the host property. However, the front porch sits somewhat awkwardly adjacent to the existing bay

³ APP/M5450/D/15/3008863

window. I observed that a number of other properties along Langland Crescent have been similarly extended.

12. The extensions combined have resulted in a significant addition to this house. When viewed from the streetscene, in the context of surrounding development, the front and side extensions are not out of keeping. The rear extension is not widely visible. Consequently, there is no harm to the character and appearance of the area.
13. I therefore conclude the proposed development does not harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It therefore accords with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016⁴ (the London Plan), Policy CS1B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012 (the Core Strategy) and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies 2013 (DMP) which together, amongst other things, seek high quality design, and development that is proportionate and respects the existing building. It also complies with the design advice in the Harrow Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guide 2010 (the SPD) and the wider design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Living conditions

14. The plans indicate that the single-storey rear ground floor extension extends 6 metres on the boundary with No. 2, to the south of the appeal site. This property has a rear extension set away from the boundary with No. 4, that projects about half the length. A window in the rear elevation of No. 2 is adjacent the flank wall of the extension, and an obscured glazed door opposite.
6. The flank wall of the extension creates a long section of wall on the boundary with No. 2 which affects the outlook from this property. As the extension along this boundary is just single-storey it does not have an overbearing impact on the adjacent property. Furthermore, I observed that the rear garden of No. 2 appears quite open, due to the width of its own garden and the relatively wide gap between the relatively short ground floor extension to No. 2 and the one forming part of the appeal proposal. There is some enclosure of this garden area as a result of the extension, but given the relative openness, this is not considered to be unacceptable.
7. I conclude that the proposed development does not unacceptably harm the living conditions of No. 2, with particular regard to outlook. The scheme therefore complies with Policy 7.6 of the London Plan and Policy DM1 of the DMP. It also accords with the SPD. These policies and guidance together seek to protect the living conditions of neighbouring properties from inappropriate development.

Conclusion

15. For these reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Rachael Pipkin

Inspector

⁴ The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011