
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 22 February 2022

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th February 2022

Appeal A Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3289857

13 Brockley Close, Stanmore, HA7 4QL

- 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 Phil Moses against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3235/21, dated 2 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is freestanding car port to front.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3289858

13 Brockley Close, Stanmore, HA7 4QL

- 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 Phil Moses against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P3261/21, dated 2 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is Outbuilding at front for use as storage.
-

Decisions

Appeal A Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3289857

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a free standing car port at 13 Brockley Close, Stanmore, HA7 4QL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/3235/21, dated 2 August 2021.

Appeal B Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3289858

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for outbuilding at front for use as storage at 13 Brockley Close, Stanmore, HA7 4QL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P3261/21, dated 2 August 2021.

Procedural Matters

3. I have used the Council's description of development in the above banner headings as they accurately and concisely describe the proposed developments.

4. As set out above, there are two appeals on the same site. I have considered each on its individual merits, but as they raise similar issues, I have combined these cases in a single decision letter.
5. At the time of my site visit the car port and the outbuilding had been fully constructed and both proposals are therefore retrospective.

Main Issue

6. The main issue in respect of both Appeal A and Appeal B is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

7. The appeal property is a two-storey detached house located in a corner plot at the end of a cul-de-sac comprising of dwellings of a similar character and appearance. There is also a large 'annex' outbuilding to the front of the dwelling, separated from the main dwelling by a driveway and scots pine tree.
8. Appeal A concerns a proposal for a freestanding canopy which sits in between the front of the house and the existing outbuilding, effectively covering the driveway.
9. Appeal B concerns a single storey storage outbuilding that is also to the front of the dwelling and is positioned adjacent to the side boundary of the site, beyond which are the long gardens of properties in The Spinney.
10. The free standing canopy is a lightweight structure, measuring 5.7 metres by 5 metres, with a curved roof with a maximum height of 3.1 metres. It comprises a black painted metal structure and guttering, with a clear polycarbonate covering. Whilst the structure is visible in the street scene, it is not visually prominent, given the location of the site at the end of the cul-de-sac. Due to its lightweight construction and open appearance, it does not detract from the host property or appear cluttered in relation to other buildings on the site. Moreover, I find that the black painted metal structure harmonises with the black painted timbers of the existing dwelling. The structure spans the gap between the dwelling and the large 'annex' outbuilding and sits beneath the large pine tree which further softens its appearance.
11. The outbuilding proposed under Appeal B measures approximately 3.3 metres width by 1.65 metres depth and has a height of 2.4m. The open design of the canopy structure means that it is possible to obtain views of the outbuilding from Brockley Close. However, it is relatively discreetly sited adjacent to the boundary of the site and is not prominently located either in relation to the host property or the street scene. It is finished with white painted render, with black painted double doors. These materials help the structure to blend in with the appearance of the main dwelling and the canopy structure.
12. I acknowledge the Council's concerns that there are no other similar structures in the immediate area. However, due to the positioning of the dwelling in a corner plot and its location at the end of the cul-de sac, I conclude that the proposed structures would not be visually obtrusive. Moreover, I find that the proposed canopy and outbuilding, due to their siting and use of materials, would relate satisfactorily to their surroundings and local context. Given the lightweight canopy structure which retains views across the frontage of the dwelling and the siting of the outbuilding adjacent to the side boundary, I do

not consider that either development would appear cluttered when viewed together or in the context of the larger existing annex outbuilding.

13. I therefore conclude that the developments proposed under Appeal A and Appeal B would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Thus, they would comply with Policy D3. D (1) and (11) of The London Plan (2021), Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM 1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies (2013) and guidance contained within the Harrow Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Design Guide (2010). Collectively, these policies and guidance require development to be informed by and respect the local character of the area, and for buildings and spaces to respond positively to local distinctiveness and to the existing character of Harrow's suburbs. The proposal would also comply with the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it requires development to be of a high-quality design.

Conditions

14. It is not necessary to impose any conditions as both developments have already been carried out.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be allowed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR