



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2021

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/20/3260303

55 Glebe Crescent, Harrow HA3 9LB

- 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 Preetam Kerai against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/2112/20, dated 22 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension; raised patio with metal railing balustrade and steps to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension; raised patio with metal railing balustrade and steps to rear at 55 Glebe Crescent, Harrow HA3 9LB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2112/20, dated 22 June 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: No. PK/GC/001, PK/GC/003 Rev A, PK/GC/004 Rev A and PK/GC/005.
 - 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) The roof area of the single storey rear extension hereby permitted shall at no time be converted to or used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity or sitting out area.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council's Decision Notice refers to Policy D1 from the Draft London Plan 2019 (DLP). In accordance with paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) weight may be given to emerging policies subject to the stage of preparation and extent of unresolved objections. There is little substantive evidence before me which allows me to make this judgement. However, as this plan is at an advanced stage but not yet adopted, I give this policy in the emerging DLP moderate weight as a material consideration.

3. I have used the Council's description of the development in reaching my decision as it more fully describes the details of the development than that given on the original planning application form. The appellant's appeal form also makes reference to the updated description.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed single storey rear extension and metal railing balustrade on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property at No. 55 Glebe Crescent consists of a two storey end-terrace dwelling with a part single and part two storey rear extension and roof alterations including a dormer roof extension at the rear. The property is located in a mature well-established residential area, typically characterised by terraced and semi-detached properties set back from the road behind a front garden/driveway.
6. I observed on my site visit that a number of the adjacent properties had single storey extensions projecting out from the rear of the buildings with raised patios and varied boundary treatments, including high metal railing entrance gates to the side vehicular access and rear gardens at Nos. 55 and 57 Glebe Crescent. The rear of the appeal property is dominated by the rear extensions and alterations, including a large single storey flat roofed extension projecting approximately 3.8m from the rear and across the full width of the house. As a result the original rhythm and harmony of the rear elevation of the terrace has been significantly eroded.
7. The appeal proposal seeks to extend the single storey element of the single storey rear extension and construct a raised patio with steps that would be enclosed by a low level metal railing balustrade and timber fencing at the rear. The new single storey flat roofed extension would project out about by an additional 3.8m from the rear elevation of the single storey extension with a flat roof and would extend across the full width of the house in line with the single storey rear extension and conservatory at the adjoining property at No. 53 Glebe Crescent.
8. The appeal property is on a relatively narrow spacious plot and as such the extension would not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size. The proposed rear extension and the raised patio with a metal railing balustrade would be seen in the context of the current varied architectural styles at the rear of the host property and the surrounding properties.
9. Against this backdrop, the scale, form and design of the proposed rear extension and metal railing balustrade would not appear significantly out of place or excessive in relation to the built form of the host property. The modest overall scale and proportions of the extension and metal railing balustrade, together with the use of matching materials and fenestrations would ensure the proposal would sit relatively unobtrusively against the two storey form of the main property. The proposal would therefore achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and as such would not detract from the architectural integrity of the host property. In addition,

the proposed development would not be visible from the road at the front and as such would not adversely impact on the street scene in the surrounding area.

10. I have considered the Council's argument's that the granting of planning permission would set a precedent for other similar developments. However, each application and appeal must be determined on its individual merits, and a generalised concern of this nature does not justify withholding permission on these grounds.
11. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would be consistent with the overall aims of Policy 7.4B of the London Plan 2016, Policy D1 of the DLP, Core Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide 2010. These policies and guidance, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development demonstrates a high quality design that respects and responds positively to existing buildings and the local character and distinctiveness of the area. In addition, the proposal would accord with the Framework that developments should seek to secure a high quality of design (paragraph 124) that are sympathetic to the local character (paragraph 127).

Conditions

12. Having regard to the Framework, and in particular paragraph 55, I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area and safeguard the amenities of the nearby residents, I have imposed a condition requiring matching external materials. In order to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties, I have also imposed a condition restricting the use of the flat roof over the extension.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR