



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2019 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3230946

102 Elms Road, Harrow Weald, Harrow HA3 6BT

- 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 Adil Arshad against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/0378/19, dated 27 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension, single storey and two storey side to rear extension and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension, single storey and two storey side to rear extension and internal alterations at 102 Elms Road, Harrow Weald, Harrow, HA3 6BT, in accordance with the application, Ref P/0378/19, dated 27 January 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: 18_078_S0, 18_078_S1, 18_078_S2, 18_078_P0, 18_078_P1 and 18_078_P2.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window(s) / door(s) other than those shown on the approved plans shall be installed on the first floor of the side elevations of the development hereby permitted.
 5. The extensions hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the southwest facing window at first floor level has been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the window is installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.
-

Appeal Procedure

6. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

7. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

8. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse on the eastern side of Elms Road. The appeal property has previously been extended to the side and rear. The front elevation incorporates a two-storey bay feature and a canopy which overhangs an existing porch and one of the front rooms at ground floor level. Although not shown on the submitted plans, I observed during my site visit that the adjacent property at No. 104 to the north has been further extended to the rear at ground-floor level by approximately 2-3m. As seen from the street and from the rear garden of the appeal site, neighbouring properties have been subject to numerous extensions.
9. The part-one/part-two storey side/rear extension would be contained to the rear of the site and would not be visible from public views. As the ridge of the two-storey element would be set below the ridge of both the original property and the existing side extension, it is considered that this element would be appropriately subservient to the height of the original building. The two-storey element would have a depth of a little under 2.5m beyond the principal rear façade of the original dwellinghouse, while the ground-floor element would broadly match the depth of neighbouring single-storey rear extensions at Nos. 100 and 104. In light of the above, it is considered that the cumulative effect of the proposed extensions in addition to the existing side extension would not appear disproportionate in relation to the original dwellinghouse. Furthermore, as surrounding properties have been similarly extended, it is considered that the resultant dwelling would respect the pattern of development in the area.
10. The proposed front extension would result in a slightly higher front canopy feature with an increased depth of approximately 0.5m beyond the bay window. Given the depth of the front driveway separating the house from the street, it is unlikely that the increased depth of the front extension relative to the bay window would be obvious from the street. While it is stated in the officer's delegated report that only the adjoining property at No. 104 has a similar, albeit historic, front extension which projects beyond its bay window, I observed during my site visit that several neighbouring properties had front porches which extended beyond their bay window, with much variety between them in terms of depth, width, roof form and materiality. Given the prevalence and variety of front porches built at neighbouring properties and the relative scale of this element of the proposal, I do not consider that the proposed front extension would cause unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of the appeal property or the surrounding area.
11. The officer's delegated report references an appeal decision at 122 Langland Crescent. However, the details of this appeal have not been provided to me to consider and, in any case, each proposal must be considered on its own merits.

12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. The development therefore complies with the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Core Policy CS1B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013 and the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2010, which all broadly require that development proposals for residential extensions must be designed to a high standard, have a proportionate relationship with the host building and respond positively to local character.

Conditions

13. The conditions which are imposed are those which have been suggested by the Council, but with some variation in the interest of clarity and precision having regard to the advice on imposing conditions in the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.
14. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the scheme be built in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt. I have also required the materials to match those of the main house so as to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
15. A condition preventing the installation of further windows on the side elevations has been imposed to protect the privacy of the occupants of neighbouring properties. A condition has also been imposed, as alluded to in the officer's report, requiring that the first-floor side-facing windows shall be obscurely glazed, to ensure the privacy of occupiers of neighbouring properties.
16. The Council's Infrastructure Team have suggested three conditions relating to drainage to be attached. However, I consider that these conditions are not reasonable or necessary in this case. As the side/rear extension would be largely built upon an existing patio, the resulting increase in surface water run off would be minimal and would not warrant an agreed scheme for surface water drainage. Furthermore, I consider that it would be unnecessary to impose a condition relating to sewage/foul water disposal given that the development is an extension to an existing dwelling.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR