



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2021

by A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/20/3261771

6 Julius Caesar Way, Stanmore HA7 4PZ

- 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 Dominic Howe against the decision of London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/1261/20, dated 4 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is conversion of garage into habitable room with alteration to front elevation; single and two storey rear extension, hard and soft landscaping at rear including the widening of retaining wall and addition of steps; demolition of conservatory.
-

Preliminary Matters

1. The application provides a lengthy and detailed description of the development proposed. I have adopted the description appearing on the decision notice and in the appeal form as this appears to be both concise and accurate.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a conversion of garage into habitable room with alteration to front elevation; single and two storey rear extension, hard and soft landscaping at rear including the widening of retaining wall and addition of steps; demolition of conservatory at 6 Julius Caesar Way, Stanmore HA7 4PZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/1261/20, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) Notwithstanding details appearing on the approved plans, the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby approved shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans; 0021-A-100-00 revision01, 0021-A-200-03 revision01, 0021-A-100-01 revision02, 0021-A-100-02 revision02, 0021-A-110-03 revision02, 0021-A-210-02 revision02, 0021-A-200-02 revision02, 20200828-01, 20200828-02.

- 4) No development above ground level shall take place until large scale details of the eaves and verge of the proposed extension have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details shall also show junctions and abutments of the proposed development with the exterior surfaces of the dwellinghouse. The works shall be completed in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and local area with particular regard to the two-storey rear extension.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached dwelling situated within a residential estate of large houses of differing designs sitting within green belt. The character and appearance of the area derives substantially from the limited palette of materials and range of traditional architectural treatments employed to create visual interest in the street scene. In this regard the rear elevations of the properties, which are less distinctive, are of less significance.
5. The proposed single storey rear extension, which partly replaces the existing conservatory and generates a small increase in the footprint of the house overall, has a wide glazed opening onto the terrace and garden. Although uncharacteristic of the architectural treatment found in the immediate area the proposed single-storey rear extension appears as an appropriate architectural response to a change in internal layout that reflects widespread taste and living preferences of the present day.
6. I note following pre-application advice the applicant made amendments to the proposal. The proposed design of the two-storey extension inserts a gable that cuts through the eaves to achieve a similar height to that on the rear elevation of the adjoining property (2 Cleopatra Close). It is therefore more prominent than would be the case for a gable originating at the existing eaves level, but is no higher than other parts of the roof of the host property. As proposed the extension neither employs traditional detailing nor adopts the architectural form in terms of eaves and fenestration arrangements found on neighbouring properties. Nevertheless, I am not persuaded that such details would be architecturally satisfactory in this case and would likely appear wholly contrived from visual conflict with the proposed ground floor extension.
7. If carefully detailed and executed this two-storey element would relate appropriately to the glassy elevation of the ground floor extension and, taken together, appear as a well-designed and not-disproportionate rear extension to a dwelling that was designed some 20 years previously. From my observations, the effect of this extension upon the character and appearance of the area will be limited due to the rear location and screening effect of surrounding development.
8. The proposed changes to the prominent front elevation are not obtrusive. Consequently, for the reasons given, I conclude that the proposed development accords with policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) and the relevant sections of the Residential Design Guide SPD which, taken together,

seek to ensure development is of a high design standard and layout. Having so concluded I find no conflict with the aspirations of the Framework for high quality design nor with Policy 7.4B of the London Plan or Policy D1 of the Draft London Plan which have similar objectives.

Conditions

9. In addition to the usual implementation condition it is necessary to define the plans in the interests of certainty. As I have indicated, specific details of the extension and materials to be employed are necessary to ensure the proposal fulfils the design objective and to protect the visual amenity of the area.

Conclusion

10. I allow the appeal subject to the conditions.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR