



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2020

by Martin Chandler BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/20/3255156

8 Holme Way, Stanmore HA7 3RE

- 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 Vivienne Badu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/0514/20, dated 7 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is new side and rear extension and new dormer window.
-

This decision is issued in accordance with Section 56 (2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended and supersedes that issued on 16 November 2020

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for new side and rear extension and new dormer window at 8 Holme Way, Stanmore HA7 3RE, in accordance with application Ref: P/0514/20 dated 7 February 2020, and subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council have made reference to drawing errors, specifically in relation to the scale bar used. This matter was corrected in drawings received with the appeal and the correction has not altered the proposal in any manner. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the original drawings are a suitable basis against which to assess the appeal and have done so accordingly.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - i) the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - ii) the living conditions for the occupants of neighbouring properties.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is a chalet style bungalow located at the end of a short cul-de-sac and is one of a series of properties which frame the end of the road. Due to its location, the side facing roofslope in which the dormer window would

be located is discreetly positioned and largely hidden from view within the street scene.

5. Similar to other properties within the street, the appeal building has a dormer window located within the front facing roofslope. This existing dormer has a hipped roof, is set back from the eaves line and the ridge is lower than the ridge of the main roof. Accordingly, it is an entirely sympathetic inclusion within the roof. The proposed dormer window would replicate the scale and form of the existing feature. It would also be set back from the front of the property. Due to its location and scale, the dormer window would be a well-proportioned addition to the roof. It would not dominate the building and instead, it would be a respectful, sympathetic and subservient addition. Moreover, due to its location at the end of the road, facing away from general views within the street, it would be a discreet addition.
6. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore accord with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) (CS), Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies (2013) (DMP) and guidance contained within the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2010) (SPD). Taken together, these seek a high standard of design that is complementary to local character.

Living conditions

7. The side facing element of the single storey extension would include two windows which would face towards No 7. However, primarily, they would look towards the neighbouring outbuilding. The floorplans confirm that these windows would serve bedrooms which would also benefit from windows in the front and rear elevations. Accordingly, the facing windows would be secondary in nature and therefore I am satisfied that the use of obscure glass would be reasonable in the interests of preserving neighbouring privacy levels. This matter could be satisfactorily resolved through the use of a suitably worded planning condition.
8. The side facing dormer would serve a proposed en-suite facility. Although the elevated nature of the window could provide views towards the neighbouring garden, due to the nature of the room, again, the use of obscure glass would satisfactorily mitigate any concerns in relation to overlooking, and I note that the appellant suggests such an approach anyway.
9. The extension to the rear would be a deep addition. However, the adjoining neighbour has already been extended and as a consequence, the projection beyond the neighbouring property would be reduced. The extension would also have a flat roof thereby reducing its overall height. Accordingly, due to its limited depth and height, the proposal would not be an enclosing form of development and it would not unduly compromise outlook. Consequently, I am satisfied that the proposal would not be overbearing or visually obtrusive.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the living conditions for the occupants of neighbouring properties. As a consequence, it would accord with Policy 7.6 of the London Plan, Policy DM1 of the DMP and guidance contained within the SPD. Taken together, these require amongst other things, development to have regard to their impact on neighbouring occupiers.

Conditions and Conclusion

11. Due to my findings set out above, conditions are necessary in the interests of clarity and precision to establish the time limit for the commencement of development as well as the approved drawing numbers. A condition is also necessary to ensure materials match those used in the existing building. Finally, as identified above, a condition regarding obscure glass is necessary to protect the privacy of the occupants of the neighbouring property.
12. Subject to these conditions, the appeal should be allowed, and planning permission granted.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall commence no later than 3 years from the date of this permission;
- 2) The development shall be implemented in accordance with drawing numbers VB – Proposed R1.1 and VB – Proposed R1.2.
- 3) The materials used in the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
- 4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the proposed side facing windows in the west side elevation have been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of those windows that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the window is installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.