
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 24 September 2019 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons)

by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2019

Appeal A Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3231353

21 The Ridgeway, Stanmore, Middlesex HA7 4BE

- 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 Uri Shalom against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/0573/19, dated 1 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is an entrance porch.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3231354

21 The Ridgeway, Stanmore, Middlesex HA7 4BE

- 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 Uri Shalom against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/1690/19, dated 3 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is an entrance porch.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is allowed and planning permission is granted for an entrance porch at 21 The Ridgeway, Stanmore, Middlesex, HA7 4BE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/0573/19, dated 1 February 2019, 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: 18962/01 Rev A and 18962/02 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposed development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
2. Appeal B is allowed and planning permission is granted for an entrance porch at 21 The Ridgeway, Stanmore, Middlesex, HA7 4BE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/1690/19, dated 3 April 2019, 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: 18962/01 Rev B and 18962/02 Rev B.
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposed development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

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

Procedural Matters

4. As set out above, there are two appeals at the same site for the development of a porch. The proposed developments in each appeal are slightly different, therefore I have considered each proposal on its individual merits, but as they raise similar issues, the cases are dealt within a single decision letter.

Main Issue

5. The main issue for both appeals is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwellinghouse in a mock Tudor style. It is located within a residential area and surrounded by other detached properties, these are set back from the highway and have a mixed design and appearance.
7. The proposed developments are entrance porches located on the front elevation of the existing dwelling. The plans submitted as part of the applications show that they would both have a hipped roof and materials to match the existing dwelling. In the proposal relating to Appeal A, the porch would have a depth of 1.75 metres and a height of 3.6 metres. In the proposal relating to appeal B the depth of the proposed porch would be 1.65 metres, with all other parts of the proposal remaining the same.
8. For both appeals, the porch would be forward of the existing bay window on the front elevation of the dwelling and, as the building is on the outside of a bend in the road, forward of existing building line. However, both proposals would not be forward of this stepped front elevation by a significant amount and would not appear as prominent or over dominant additions to the front of the dwelling. Although, the proposed porches would slightly wrap around the front elevation, this would be minimal and it is not considered that this would constitute poor design and would not detrimentally impact upon the overall appearance of the property.
9. The proposed developments would be visible within the streetscene, due to their positioning on the front elevation of the dwelling, however they are both modestly size in comparison to the host dwelling. Due to the mixture of architectural styles within the locality the proposed porches would not appear out of keeping within their surroundings and would not have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the area.

10. It is noted that the Harrow Residential Design Guide SPD states that small front porches may be permitted provided that they do not project significantly forward of the front bay window. As stated previously, it is considered that both proposals would not be significantly forward of the bay window and therefore would not be contrary to this guidance.
11. Accordingly, I find the proposal in both appeals would not harm the character or appearance of the host property or its surroundings. As such, they would not be in conflict with Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of The London Plan (March 2016), Policies D1 and D2 of The Draft London Plan (December 2017), Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (February 2012) or Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies (July 2013) which collectively seek to ensure development has a high standard of design and is appropriate to its surroundings.

Other Matters

12. In both appeals the neighbour raised concerns with regard to the scale and appearance of the extensions and these are addressed above. In addition for the planning application relating to appeal B, concerns were raised regarding a potential for loss of light to occur. However, due to the modest size of the proposed porch and the ample space between the detached properties, it is not considered that the proposed development would have a significant impact upon the living conditions of the occupiers of this neighbouring property.

Conditions

13. For both appeals, in addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, I have attached a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plans, as this provides certainty. A condition requiring the use of materials matching that of the existing building is also necessary to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development.
14. It is noted that for the planning application relating to appeal A, a consultee suggested a condition regarding surface water disposal. However, this condition has not been requested by the Council and, due to the minor nature and size of the development, I do not consider it necessary and therefore it has not been included.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeals are allowed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis appeal A and appeal B are both allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR