
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2021

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3277164
69 Worple Way, Harrow HA2 9SW

- 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 Sripragash Pararajasingam against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/1289/21, dated 26 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extension to roof to form end gable; enlargement of rear dormer; single and two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. 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. I shall determine the appeal on this basis accordingly.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - (i) the character and appearance of the host property and the area, and
 - (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property at No. 67 Worple Way with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a two storey extended semi-detached dwelling located in a mature well-established residential area, typically characterised by detached and semi-detached properties set back from the road behind a front garden/driveway. The surrounding semi-detached properties are of comparable scale and form, with distinctive double projecting gabled front bay windows and traditional hipped and gabled tiled roofs.

5. The appeal site has an extensive planning history relating to proposals to extend the property. The proposal would involve the enlargement of the existing single storey flat roofed rear extension and a first floor rear extension over the south-western corner of the host property. The first floor extension would be set back from the rear elevation of the extended house and stepped down below the ridge of the host property with a pitched hipped tiled roof.
6. The appeal property is on a relatively spacious plot and as such the extensions would not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size. Given the site's location, the proposed first floor rear extension would only be partially visible between the buildings when passing the site. I observed on my site visit that a number of the adjacent properties had single storey and two storey extensions projecting out from the side and rear of the buildings. The new single storey rear extension and first floor rear extension would be seen in the context of the current varied architectural styles at the rear of the host property and the surrounding properties.
7. Against this backdrop, the scale, form and siting of the single storey rear extension and first floor rear extension would not look significantly out of place or excessive in relation to the built form of the host property and the adjacent properties. The overall scale and proportions of the rear extensions together with use of matching materials and fenestrations would ensure the development sits relatively unobtrusively against the two storey form of the host property. The proposed rear extensions would therefore achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and as such would limit any significant adverse impacts on the street scene.
8. The proposal would also involve the construction of hip to gabled roof extension over the side of the house and enlargement of the existing rear flat roof dormer extension across the full width of the extended roof. The dormer extension would be inset from the eaves and shared party wall with the adjoining property and stepped down below the ridge line of the main property.
9. Although the gabled roof over the side of the house would not look significantly out of place or excessive in relation to the built form of the host property and the adjacent properties, the scale and form of the proposed flat roofed dormer extension would nevertheless still be a significant addition relative to the main house. Although set in and stepped down, the proposed rear dormer extension would result in substantial bulk being added to the roof plane with only very narrow peripheral parts of the sloping roof being evident.
10. The consequential harm would not in my view be sufficiently resolved by the limited effect of the proposed rear dormer extension on the street scene. In any case, the proposal would be visible at the rear from the surrounding properties. I therefore consider that the proposed rear dormer extension, by virtue of its scale, siting and design, would fail to achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and would detract from the architectural integrity of the host property. As such, I consider that the proposed rear dormer extension would result in an incongruous and out-of-keeping addition that would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area.
11. I have considered the appellant's arguments that the design and layout of the proposed rear dormer extension has been carefully considered in order to

minimise any impacts on the host property and the area. Whilst the use of matching materials and fenestrations would assist in integrating the proposal with the host property, these aspects do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above.

12. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed rear dormer extension would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would be contrary to the overall aims of Policies D3.D(1) and D3.D(11) of the London Plan 2021, Core Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013 (DMP) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide 2010 (SPD). 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.

Living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property

13. The proposed single storey rear extension would be located adjacent to the two storey property at No. 67 Worple Way (No. 67). The adjoining property at No. 67 has a small patio area leading out to an enclosed garden area at the rear. The proposed rear extension would project about 6m along the common shared boundary with No. 67 and would be separated from the rooms and garden at the rear of the adjacent property by a high close boarded fence running between the properties.
14. Whilst I accept that there would be some impact from the proposed development, given the height and design of the single storey rear extension, together with the boundary treatment and the separation distance between the properties, I consider that the extension would not significantly dominate the views to cause an overbearing effect and an unacceptable sense of enclosure from the rear windows and garden at the rear of No. 67. The outlook at the rear of No. 67 is already toward the blank side elevation of the existing single storey extension at No. 69 and the high boundary fence running along the shared common boundary between the properties.
15. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed single storey rear extension would not result in an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property at No. 67 Worple Way with particular regard to outlook. It would be consistent with the overall aims of Policies D3.D(1) and D3.D(7) of the London Plan 2021, Policy DM1 of the DMP and the Council's SPD, which I consider are relevant in this case. These policies and guidance seek, amongst other things, to ensure that new development achieves a high standard of amenity that deliver appropriate outlook and amenity to future and neighbouring occupiers.

Other Matters

16. I have considered the various benefits put forward by the appellant that the proposal would bring including the scheme's high quality design and providing additional accommodation to meet the needs of the appellant. While I have given them some weight, these benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified. For all these reasons, there are no other material considerations to outweigh the development plan conflicts identified.

Conclusion

17. Notwithstanding my findings on the lack of significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, this is significantly outweighed by the harm found regarding the character and appearance of the host property and the area. The proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR