
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1st October 2019

by J Williamson BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3233427

11 Kenmore Gardens, Edgware, HA8 5HE

- 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 Mrs Manisha Gohil against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/1612/19, dated 2 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for single-storey rear extension at 11 Kenmore Gardens, Edgware, HA8 5HE, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P/1612/19, dated 2 April 2019, subject to the conditions outlined below:
 - 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: 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed rear extension on the host property and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The application site comprises a semi-detached bungalow, which is one of 6 bungalows, ie 3 pairs of semi-detached, located at the head of a cul-de-sac. The cul-de-sac includes approximately 10-12 other dwellings, all two-storey, comprising a mix of detached, semi-detached and a short terrace of 3 dwellings. It is noted that there is a publicly accessible path/track to the rear of the site.
4. The bungalow has benefitted from previous extensions, including a side dormer, single-storey side/rear extensions and a porch. Based on the figures provided in the Officer Report, which I have no reason to doubt, the footprint of the proposed extension would be approximately 9.5 sqm. The Council has

concluded that, with the proposed addition, the footprint of the dwelling would have increased by 56 sqm. The Council suggests that none of the other bungalows in the cul-de-sac have been extended. However, I note that, although this may be the case, some of the bungalows have erected outbuildings and several of the two-storey dwellings within the cul-de-sac have been extended, not always in a sympathetic manner and in some instances evidently visible from the street.

5. The proposed extension would be sited such that it would infill a corner between the existing side and rear extensions. Given its siting and modest size it would not be visible from any public vantage points, including the path/track to the rear of the property, as there is a boundary wall approximately 2m high along the rear of the site. In fact, the proposal would only be visible, and even then, barely noticeably, from a few first-floor windows of properties to the rear of the site.
6. Furthermore, I consider that the proposed extension needs to be considered within the context of the size of the plot, and not just the size of its footprint relative to the original building. Given the size of the plot, which appears to be the largest of the 6 bungalows, should the proposed extension be constructed, there would still be a greater proportion of the plot without any building on it than that with.
7. I appreciate the Council's calculations suggest that the proposal may result in the original property being extended disproportionately. However, within the context of the site and the surrounding area, I consider that the proposed development would not result in unsympathetic extensions to the host property; it would add little in the way of bulk and its presence will barely be known. As such, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the integrity of the existing building or the character or appearance of the surrounding area.
8. As such, the proposal would accord with policies DM1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies 2013, CS1 B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, 7.4B and 7.6B of the London Plan, guidance in the Harrow Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document and paragraphs 124 and 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework; which collectively, and amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development is of high quality design and has regard to the massing, scale, proportionality and architectural style of original buildings and surrounding properties and respects existing patterns of development and the character of the area.

Other Matters

9. Should the Council consider works have been undertaken at the site in breach of planning control, this would be a matter for the Council and not this s78 appeal.

Conditions

10. I have applied standard conditions regarding timescale, plans and materials, as suggested by the Council, to ensure works are completed in a timely manner, in accordance with the plans and to protect the character and appearance of the area.
11. I note that the Council received consultation comments regarding foul and surface water disposal, with the suggestion that a condition should be attached

to any approval requiring details to be submitted and approved. The proposed development is simply an extension to the existing property, and no details have been provided to suggest that the proposed works would not be connected to existing foul and surface water drainage systems, which would have to adhere to current building regulations standards. Consequently, I consider a condition requiring such details would not be necessary or reasonable.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, the appeal is allowed, subject to the conditions listed.

J Williamson

INSPECTOR