



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/20/3264554
8 Elms Road, Harrow, HA3 6BE

- 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 Asif Chaudhary against the decision of London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3418/20, dated 23 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is extension to existing outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension to the existing outbuilding at 8 Elms Road Harrow HA3 6BE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/3418/20, 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 (all prefixed PL/SM) 1833/00, 1833-01, 1833-02, 1833-03.
 - 4) The detached outbuilding hereby permitted shall not be occupied or used at any time as a separate residential unit nor other than as ancillary or incidental to the single residential use of the appeal site.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a large detached dwelling sitting within a substantial plot in an established residential area. The outbuilding proposed to be extended by around one third of its footprint is of modest height sitting at a lower level to, and at a distance from, the host dwelling (No.8) and its neighbours. The site is

surrounded by good-sized gardens containing some trees. Importantly, although visible from some surrounding properties, the extended outbuilding would not easily, if at all, be seen from any public viewpoint.

4. Although the proposed development would slightly reduce the extent of available garden this would be from its current generous size; further, due to its modest height, location and setting in relation to the host dwelling and surrounding development, the resultant building would not be more obtrusive or significantly change the perceived scale and massing of built form from that currently found. The proposed extension to the outbuilding will not unduly change the relationship of the outbuilding with nearby development and, therefore, will not harm the pattern of development in the locality of the appeal site or materially harm the character and appearance of this suburban area.
5. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not conflict with Policy CS1(B) of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) or relevant guidance set out in the Council's Residential Design Guide (2010) which, taken together, seek to promote a high standard of design, to protect the character of suburban areas and ensure that development does not harm visual and residential amenity. Having concluded thus I also find no conflict with the provisions of the adopted or emerging London Plan.

Conditions

6. In addition to ensuring the development is constructed in accordance with the plans approved, conditions pertaining to the use of suitable materials and to ensure the appropriate use of the resultant building are necessary to protect the residential and visual amenity of the locality.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given I conclude that the proposal accords with the development plan taken as a whole and that in consequence the appeal succeeds.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR