



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2019

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th December 2019.

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3233374

64 Weighon Road, Harrow HA3 6HZ

- 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 Malvia White against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/2026/19, dated 1 May 2019 was refused by notice dated 10 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension to provide an en-suite bedroom and an enlarged kitchen and for an outbuilding at rear of garden to provide a gymnasium for family use.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side extension to provide an en-suite bedroom and enlarged kitchen and for an outbuilding at rear of garden to provide a gymnasium for family use at 64 Weighon Road, Harrow HA3 6HZ in accordance with application P/2026/19, dated 1 May 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 hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan; Proposed Ground Floor Plan Drawing No 02; Proposed Front (North) Elevation Plan Drawing No 03; Proposed Side (East) Elevation Plan Drawing No 04; Proposed Section Drawing No 05 and Proposed Gymnasium Floor Plan and Elevation Drawing No 07.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Procedural Matter

2. The proposed development included two distinct parts, an outbuilding and a single storey side extension to the host property. The Council have confirmed that they have no objection to the side extension, and I have been given no evidence that would lead me to a different conclusion. My reasoning below therefore relates only to the outbuilding.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the outbuilding upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area and upon the living conditions of nearby occupiers.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached property located within a residential area. To the front of the property is a porch and mono-pitch canopy extending to the side. To the rear is a modest single storey rear extension linked to a detached garage located along the boundary with No 66. The garden is set down from the rear of the house and is generous in size. The rear boundaries comprise timber fencing and tall planting. A number of properties benefit from outbuildings at the end of their gardens.
5. The proposed outbuilding would be sited close to neighbouring boundaries and would have a height of approximately 3.5m. Paragraph 6.77 of Supplementary Planning Document 'Harrow Residential Design Guide' (SPD) sets out a number of recommendations in relation to outbuildings including numerical guidance and design considerations. The document advises that where outbuildings are sited within 2m of neighbouring boundaries a maximum height of 2.5m is recommended.
6. The outbuilding would be taller than the boundary treatment, however, it would not be so tall that it would create a sense of enclosure or diminish the enjoyment of neighbouring gardens, particularly given the generous size of gardens in the local area and as it would be largely obscured from neighbouring properties by fencing and planting.
7. Whilst the proposal would not fully accord with the numerical guidance set out in paragraph 6.77 of the SPD I find that in this particular case the proposed development would accord with the design guidance in relation to outbuildings as the overall width, height and position of the outbuilding would not result in an unduly prominent or obtrusive building given it would be located at the end of the garden, it would be proportionate to the size of the original dwelling and its appearance would match that of the host property. Therefore, I am satisfied that the outbuilding would be acceptable and would not harm the character or appearance of the area.
8. In conclusion the development would accord with Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of the London Plan (2016), Policy CS1B of the Harrow Core Strategy, Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) supported by Supplementary Planning Document 'Harrow Residential Design Guide' which seeks high quality design that respects the host property, has regard to the pattern and grain of existing spaces, development that makes a positive contribution to the local area and does not harm the amenity of surrounding land.

Other Matters

9. I have considered the representations received in relation to the application. There is no substantive evidence to suggest that the development would adversely impact on flooding, particularly as the Drainage Authority raise no objection. Issues of maintenance fall outside the scope of the planning system thus I have given this matter negligible weight.

Conditions

10. I have considered the imposition of conditions in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition it is necessary in the interests of precision, to define the plans with which the development should accord. A condition requiring matching materials is required in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above the appeal is allowed.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR