
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2019

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3236009

21 The Middle Way, Harrow HA3 7EG

- 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 A Niazi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/2460/19, dated 1 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "single side and part 2 storey rear extensions and single retrospective rear extension."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single side and part 2 storey rear extensions and single retrospective rear extension at 21 The Middle Way, Harrow HA3 7EG, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2460/19, dated 1 June 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan; Existing Elevations; Proposed Elevations; Existing and Proposed Ground Floor Plans; Existing and Proposed 1st Floor Plans.
 - 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 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no windows or doors, other than those shown on approved plans shall be installed in the side walls of the development hereby permitted.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The area in which the appeal site lies is characterised by residential properties of semi-detached and terraced form. The properties in the area are large two

storey dwellings with the appeal property being an end house of a row of properties.

4. The proposed rear extensions would be sympathetic in design and scale with the first floor rear extension having a roof form which matches the existing property. I note there are examples of small scale first floor rear extensions in the area and the proposed first floor extension would be modest in size. The first floor and ground floor rear extensions combined would be subordinate to the appeal property and not appear excessively wide and not be dominant features within the surrounding area.
5. The side extension would be sensitive in terms of its overall mass with a pitched roof element at the front which would ensure that it would not be an intrusive or bulky structure. Due to its size and design, the side extension would not be an incongruous feature and would not look out of place within the existing pattern of development.
6. I have had regard to the Councils Officer Report including previous applications¹. However, I do not have full details of these development schemes and so cannot be sure how they relate to the appeal proposal, including in respect of size. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
7. The proposed extensions, when cumulatively assessed, would not be discordant structures and would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area. The proposal would accord with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies 2013, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guide 2010 which seeks development to achieve a high standard of design and layout which should not be detrimental to local character and appearance.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. I have imposed a condition relating to materials in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area. In the interests of safeguarding the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties, a condition is imposed restricting further window and door openings on the side elevations.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR

¹ Local Planning Authority References: P/0275/18/PRIOR and P/0779/19