

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2021

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/20/3261578

59 Lankers Drive, Harrow, HA2 7PA

- 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 Amit Sharma against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/1851/20, dated 3 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side/rear extension to join up to existing single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposed development is taken from the application form. The decision notice describes the proposed development as "Single storey rear in-fill extension; External alterations."

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 61 Lankers Drive, with regards to outlook and daylight.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling within a residential area.
 5. The surrounding area is characterised by the presence of two storey semi-detached dwellings from a similar period, set back from the road behind short parking areas and/or gardens and with long gardens to the rear. Gaps between pairs of dwellings and the presence of short grass verges and street trees combine with the set-backs to provide for a sense of spaciousness and occasional greenery.
 6. During my site visit I observed that many properties have been altered and/or extended and that such changes generally appear subservient to host properties and in keeping with the character of the area.
-

7. The appeal property has been extended to the side and rear at ground floor level such that the dwelling extends across much of the width of the property to the boundary with No 61 Lankers Drive. No 61 has not been extended and there is a small gap between its side elevation and the boundary with the appeal property.
8. During my site visit, I observed that the original rear elevation of the appeal property extends further to the rear than that of No 61. However, whilst the ground floor rear extension to No 59 therefore projects a considerable distance beyond the rear elevation of No 61, there is a gap between the side elevation of the extension and the shared boundary.
9. The proposed development would effectively fill this gap. In so doing, it would result in a long, tall, blank wall projecting alongside the appeal property's boundary with its neighbour for some considerable distance.
10. The height, appearance and considerable projection of the proposal would, when combined with its immediate proximity to No 61, result in it appearing to "loom above" No 61's rear garden. This would lead to such a sense of enclosure that the proposal would draw attention to itself as an overbearing feature.
11. Further, the harm arising from this would be exacerbated as a result of the proposal being located immediately to the south of No 61, whereby the height, length and proximity of the proposal would result in a detrimental impact on the amount of sunlight and daylight received by this neighbouring property.
12. Whilst I note that a small garage was previously located in the general location of the proposed development, I am mindful that this garage was demolished to accommodate the existing single storey development and that its form and siting were different to the development proposed. The fact that a garage was previously located to the rear of the appeal property does not provide a precedent for the proposal the subject of this appeal.
13. The appellant, in support of the proposal, draws attention to other developments nearby. However, the specific circumstances relating to each of these examples are not the same as those the subject of this appeal. Notwithstanding this, I have found that the proposed development would result in significant harm and this is not something that is mitigated by the presence of other developments elsewhere.
14. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the Framework, to London Plan (2016) Policy 7.6B, to DMP¹ Policy DM1 and to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010), which together amongst other things, seek to protect residential amenity.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

¹ Reference: Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).