



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2022

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3288692

Green Court, Orley Farm Road, Harrow, HA1 3PG

- 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 Dr S Vora against the decision of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3291/21 dated 5 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey side infill and first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side infill and first floor rear extension at Green Court, Orley Farm Road, Harrow, HA1 3PG in accordance with the terms of the application ref: Ref P/3291/21 dated 5 August 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years, beginning with the date of this decision;
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the submitted material details and following approved plans: Location Plan (unreferenced), proposed site plan (dwg. no. 201), proposed elevations (dwg. no. 210), proposed elevations (dwg. no. 211), proposed ground floor plan (dwg. no. 207), proposed first floor plan (dwg. no. 208), proposed loft and roof plan (dwg. no. 209).

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the impact of the proposal upon i) the original dwellinghouse and ii) the wider South Hill Conservation Area and Special Character Area.

Reasons

Original dwellinghouse

3. The appeal site is a two storey detached dwelling with a detached garage accessed via a gravel/hardstanding driveway as well as a separate pedestrian access to the front boundary which is roughly slabbed. The site is located within the South Hill Avenue Conservation Area (CA), Harrow on the Hill Area of Special Character. The appeal property is not listed but it is noted to be subject to an Article 4 Direction.
4. At the time of my site visit I note that the existing single storey rear wrap around extension, shown on the existing plans, had already been demolished but I could see footings outlining its previous location which match the plans.

5. The front elevation which, as can be seen from the plans, would remain largely unaltered as a result of the proposals given that the single storey side extension has been designed to match the existing side extension. This element would bring built form forward by 0.9m but I do not consider this to have impact upon the host dwelling as I find that it would still read as a subservient addition to the property as infill to the existing side extension which was present based upon the plans before me. Taken in isolation I find the single storey side infill extension to be appropriate for the host building at the appeal site due to its essentially negligible impact.
6. I note that the host dwelling has already been extended. The first floor rear extension would continue the width of the existing rear extension and twin pitched roof by 3m. Part of this element would be over the former existing single storey flat roof extension and part over the existing patio. I noted, at the time of my site visit, that due to the site levels the building itself is cut into the garden at a lower level than the garden to the rear/side and this element is limited to the rear of the property. No key, public facing, elements are affected. From the rear the roof form would be continued by the proposals. The key changes are ultimately the cumulative depth of the rear extensions when viewed from the side elevations and I find that the extensions, due to overall design, still read as extensions to the original building. I do not find the addition of 3m to result in cumulative scale which would result in excessive bulk, scale or massing or which would result in incongruous development.
7. Whilst the extensions to the rear (cumulatively) would be large I do not find that it would result in the original dwelling being subsumed. I find it is clear, as a result of design and detailing, what is the original dwelling and that views of this (discussed below) remain acceptable for the appearance of the site and host building. The building would remain as a large dwelling within a large, spacious, plot as is currently its main characteristic. It would be sympathetic to the existing building and respects its surroundings in terms of siting, scale, mass and bulk.
8. The proposal would be consistent with Harrow Core Strategy 2012 (CS) Policy CS1 (B) which requires proposals to respect their host building and Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013 (LP) Policy which seeks to ensure regard for detailing, roof form and materials (the appearance of proposed buildings). The proposal would be consistent with LP Policy DM7 which requires proposals to conserve the assets affected with regard to relevant issues such as design, character, proportion, scale, height massing, bulk and materials.
9. The proposal would also be consistent with London Plan 2021 (LDN) Policy D3D(1) which requires proposals to positive respond to local distinctiveness through scale, appearance and shape and LDN Policy D3D(11) which requires proposals to respect and enhance the heritage assets and architectural features that contribute to local character.

South Hill Conservation Area and Special Character Area

10. At the time of my visit I walked up and down Orley Farm Road and viewed the appeal site from several points including the junction with Hill Close to the East and the small cul-de-sac on the bend to the West. I noted that the site benefits from a well-established tree and hedgerow boundary which I find to limit views into the site from such viewpoints within the wider streetscene. I

find that views of the proposal would be extremely limited in oblique angles due to this screening even considering that, at the time of my site visit, the time of year would have been one where tree cover is at its most limited.

11. The clearest views of the appeal site are of the front elevation immediately in front of the site which, as can be seen from the plans, would remain largely unaltered as a result of the proposals as the single storey side extension has been designed to match the existing side extension. This element would bring built form forward by 0.9m but I do not consider this to have any visual impact upon the CA given views of it would be extremely limited due to the boundary treatment as described.
12. The appeal site is within a large plot and the proposals would maintain a distance of in excess of 14m from the rear boundary. It would not appear excessive in scale or cramped within the plot. The site would, I find, still appear open and spacious which is the contributing factor to the character of the area as a result of an increase in built footprint which is marginal. In terms of appearance I find that views of the appeal site would still present as a large, detached, dwelling in a spacious plot characteristic of the Garden Suburbs as noted. This would be consistent with the South Hill Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (CAAMS) which notes the visual quality of the streetscene is enhanced by densely planted gardens and lush boundaries as well as the feeling of openness. The proposal would maintain the leafy appearance and wide grass verges noted design in by Unwin and Parker in 1903.
13. The CAAMS is specific in its recognition that elevations not facing a highway, waterway or open space are of less significance and importance to the CA. In the context of the appeal site, the east and rear elevations already contain single storey extensions and they are not prominent in the streetscene. The proposal does not alter decorative features visible from Orley Farm Road as noted within the Arts and Crafts description. Overall the assets of the area described in the CAAMS, as listed from 1 – 5 by the Conservation Officer in their response, I find are maintained as a result of the proposals.
14. I note the Conservation Officer references an appeal from 2007 in their report, however, no details as to the scheme are provided with this appeal for me to consider the context. The planning history outline, in the Council's delegated report, suggests this was for a proposal incomparable to that before me in this appeal. Despite this I note the Inspector's description that the appeal property and adjacent houses are separated by extensive areas of garden which contribute to a sense of spaciousness to the character of the area and adding to the variety in the street scene. I find that the current proposal before me is consistent with this description, and the wider site as noted in other appeals referred to (but with no further details) at Hillsfoot and 1 Orley Farm Road and maintains the site as characteristic for a "Garden Suburb".
15. The visual quality of the streetscene and Conservation Area will be maintained. I do not find that the proposal would result in harm to the South Hill Conservation Area and Special Character Area and I also note that the Harrow Conservation Areas Advisory Committee have, notably, not objected. Whilst generally a lack of objection is a neutral consideration I consider that a lack of objection from a group which exists to pursue protection of the historic

environment to be a relevant consideration within this appeal given the refusal reason and main issues before me.

16. The proposal would be consistent with CS Policy CS1 (B) which requires proposals to respond positively to the local and historic context in terms of design and siting, LP Policy DM1 which seeks to ensure proposals have regard for massing, bulk, scale and height in relation to the location and LP Policy DM6 which requires proposals to be considered having regard to the impact of the proposals upon the strategic value of the area of special character. The proposal would also be consistent with LP Policy DM7 which requires proposals to conserve the assets affected and their setting with regard to character appraisals and management plans as well as relevant issues of design, appearance and character.
17. The proposal would also be consistent with LDN Policy D3D(1) which requires proposals to respond to local distinctiveness with regard to existing building types, forms and proportions and LDN Policy D3D(11) which requires proposals to respond to the existing character of a place and respect and enhance the heritage assets and architectural features that contribute to local character. The proposal would be consistent with LDN Policy HC1 which requires development proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, to conserve their significance by being sympathetic to the assets significant and appreciation with their surroundings.
18. The proposal would also be consistent with Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 paragraphs 195 and 199 respectively for proposals affecting heritage assets.

Conditions

19. The Council have not suggested any conditions in the event this appeal is allowed. A time condition is attached to comply with section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. A condition requiring the development to be in accordance with the approved plans and materials is required to control and define the development which is granted consent.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR