



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2020

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/20/3257848

2 Capuchin Close, Stanmore HA7 3RL

- 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 Hana Hussain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/1508/20, dated 1 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2020.
 - The development proposed was originally described as 'Bungalow with a proposed 5m rear extension and 2.5m side extension to the rear section of the bungalow on its right. Proposal for a 4m x 4m conservatory to the rear right end of the bungalow'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension at 2 Capuchin Close, Stanmore HA7 3RL, in accordance with the application Ref. P/1508/20, dated 1 May 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - (1) The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
 - (2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 site location plan and drawing nos: CCST-504 P02 (Proposed Site Layout), CCST-505 P02 (Proposed Plans) and CCST-506 P02 (Proposed Elevations) all dated 17.06.2020.
 - (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 dwelling.

Procedural Matter

2. Revised plans were submitted during the application process reducing the depth of the extension and removing a proposed conservatory. I have therefore assessed the proposal on the basis of these revised plans and the simplified revised description on the Council's decision notice which refers to 'single storey rear extension'.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within a close-knit residential area and is discreetly positioned between the curtilages of neighbouring bungalows on Capuchin

Close and Temple Mead Close. The appeal site and these neighbouring properties are characterised by detached L-shaped bungalows situated within relatively small plots. The dwelling at No 2 is accessed via a communal footpath and does not have a frontage to the road. Private garden areas are provided to the front and rear of the dwelling. The property also shares rear boundaries with the large rear gardens serving the substantial two-storey detached dwellings on Gordon Avenue.

5. The development would increase the proportion of the plot occupied by the footprint of the dwelling. Even so, the design of the extension would harmonise with the scale and appearance of the existing dwelling and small garden areas would be retained. The development and the relationship with its plot would not be highly perceptible from the street. Whilst the development would be likely to be appreciable from neighbouring rear gardens and windows, this alone does not persuade me that it would be likely to appear particularly at odds with the existing intimate characteristics of the cluster of bungalows that the appeal site sits within.
6. I conclude that the development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that particular regard, the development would comply with the parts which seek to ensure that development is not detrimental to local character and appearance within Policies 7.4 (Local Character) and 7.6 (Architecture) of The London Plan (2016), Core Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and Policy DM1 (Achieving a High Standard of Development) of the Harrow Development Management Policies (2013). The extension would also accord with the guidance in the Harrow Council Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010) which amongst other things requires that extensions harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original dwellinghouse.

Other Matters

7. I acknowledge the concerns raised by third parties. The proposed extensions would be unlikely to have a detrimental impact upon any significant trees, particularly given the position of the extensions set away from boundaries and that there were no trees within the site at the time of my visit. The availability or not of parking space for construction vehicles, and the potential for these vehicles to obstruct emergency vehicles, are not material planning considerations for a householder development of this scale. Any issues with accessibility to the site to enable the development to take place and the potential for damage to occur to neighbouring property are private matters.

Conditions

8. I attach a condition to confirm the approved drawing numbers in the interests of clarity. A condition requiring that materials match the existing dwelling is also reasonable and necessary in order to ensure the development harmonises with the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out, the appeal is allowed.

M Russell INSPECTOR