



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 August 2022

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3299851

3 Ash Close, Stanmore, Middlesex HA7 3RH

- 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 Soni against the decision of Harrow Council.
 - The application Ref P/2885/21, dated 23 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension at 3 Ash Close, Stanmore, Middlesex HA7 3RH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2885/21, dated 23 June 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawing nos: 1198 - 000, 001, 002, 003, 004, 005 and 006.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2010 ('SPD') requires extensions to harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building and the locality. Having regard to the space around detached buildings, it sets out at paragraph 6.45 that a 'terracing effect' should be avoided.
4. Ash Close and nearby Gordon Avenue are characterised by large detached properties, which are set back from the highway behind gardens and parking forecourts. The dwellings on Ash Close, most of which form a long, staggered line at the head of the cul-de-sac, typically retain a significant gap to their neighbours above ground floor level.

5. The host and 1 Ash Close ('No 1') are the only two properties on this side of the road. Their form is broadly similar, as is the alignment of their front faces. However, the front elevation of No 1 is mainly finished in brown timber boarding and grey stone, which contrasts markedly with the host's light painted render. Additionally, given the slope of the road, No 1 is at a significantly higher level.
6. The side wall of the proposed extension would be sited very close to the boundary, leaving only a small gap to the first floor side face of No 1. However, its eaves would be notably lower compared to the adjacent development, and it would be finished in render, not timber. Additionally, its front face would be set back relative to the host's principal elevation, its ridge would be set slightly down, and it would have a hipped roof which would slope away from the boundary. Consequently, and as there are only two dwellings on this side of the road, there would not be a significant terracing effect.
7. With a width of around 2.7m, the scheme's scale would be relatively modest, and its broad form, its materials and its fenestration would respect the style and appearance of the host. I agree with the Council that it would be a proportionate addition.
8. Amongst other things, and in general terms, Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies 2013 require development proposals to deliver a high standard of design that responds positively to local distinctiveness and character, with regard to matters including scale and spacing, and to respect the host building. The National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework') also requires high quality design.
9. For the above reasons, the scheme would not conflict with those policies, or with the stance in the SPD.
10. Having regard to the tests in the Framework, and the Council's suggested conditions, the standard time limit condition is necessary, as is, in the interests of certainty, a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings. Finally, in the interests of good design, a matching materials condition is also necessary.
11. For the above reasons, the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area. Consequently, having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR