



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2019 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by P J Davies BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3232708

61 Bush Grove, Stanmore HA7 2DY

- 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 Tony Portou against the decision of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/1726/19, dated 9 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "the retention of glass canopy in rear garden".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a glass canopy and raised decking to rear of 61 Bush Grove, Stanmore, HA7 2DY in accordance with the terms of application Ref P/1726/19, dated 9 March 2019, and the plans numbered PL100, PL103 and PL104.

Appeal Procedure

2. 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.

Procedural Matters

3. Notwithstanding the description of the development used in the application, in the interest of accuracy, I have amended this to a glass canopy and raised decking.
4. The application was submitted retrospectively and during the site visit I observed that the works have been carried out. I have considered the proposal on this basis.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, and on the living conditions of the occupants of 59 and 63 Bush Grove, having particular regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

6. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey detached property situated within an established residential area characterised by detached and semi-detached
-

dwellings of similar size and design. The appeal property has a recent rear extension which was erected before the installation of decking and a glass canopy to which this appeal relates.

7. The character of the area to the rear of the houses on this part of Bush Grove is typical of residential rear gardens, with various outbuildings, patios and domestic paraphernalia. Many of the properties benefit from single storey rear extensions. Although the canopy and decking, in conjunction with the previous extension, extends out a considerable amount to the rear and would not be subservient to the depth of the original house, I do not find it appears obtrusive. The open sides and rear do not add any significant bulk to the structure, giving it a lightweight appearance. In addition, the glass canopy sits below the eaves of the rear extension and thus appears as a subservient element. In the context that I have described, the scale and design of the development respects the appearance of the host dwelling and the area and does not constitute poor design.
8. I conclude that the development does not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It is therefore in accordance with policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (the 'Local Plan'), policy CS1(B) of the Harrow Core Strategy, policies 7.4(B) and 7.6(B) of the London Plan (2016), the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), and the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'NPPF') which together seek to ensure proposals are well designed and contribute positively to the character and appearance of the surrounding area in which they lie.

Living conditions

9. The glass canopy is visible to the occupiers of surrounding properties, namely 59 and 63 Gloucester Grove. Although Nos 59 and 63 have views of the development from within their gardens, given the lightweight and transparent nature of the development and that it is partly screened by common boundary treatment, I do not find there is any harmful impact on the outlook of the occupiers of these two properties. Whilst the depth of the development would exceed the guidance in the SPD, such advice should be applied flexibly to the particular circumstances of each case. In the circumstances I have described, there would be no material conflict with the general thrust of the SPD to safeguard residents' living conditions.
10. I conclude there is no unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of 59 and 63 Gloucester Grove. The development therefore accords with policy DM1 of the Local Plan, policy 7.6 of the London Plan, as well as the NPPF which together aim to ensure a high standard of amenity for all residents.

Recommendation

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

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

P J Davies

INSPECTOR