



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2022

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3303763

53 Suffolk Road, Harrow HA2 7QF

- 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 Nahyan Godil against the decision of London Borough of Harrow Council.
 - The application Ref: P/0940/22 dated 7 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 May 2022.
 - The application is for proposed single storey front extension incorporating porch; single storey and two storey side to rear extension; single storey rear extension; alterations and extension to roof; rear dormer; rooflights in front and both side roofslopes; external steps at rear; extension of hardstanding at front; external alterations (demolition of attached garage).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice and differs from that used on the Appellant's original application. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development is the same as that used by the Council and as such I have used this description accordingly which I feel accurately represents the scope of the proposals.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area and upon the living conditions of neighbours.

Reasons

4. Suffolk Road is characterised primarily by mid century detached and semi detached houses that appear to exhibit the typical qualities of mid twentieth century suburban design that was fashionable around the time. Although some properties have been modified the vast majority of houses along Suffolk Road exhibit a general consistency in design that contributes in a positive manner to the character and appearance of the area. Such uniform motifs as Mock Tudor details, simple gable roofs and brick detailing all contribute to this character.

5. The appeal property exhibits many of these details and although it has lost much of its timber Mock Tudor detailing to its front gable, the property does still form part of a row of four seemingly near identical houses, each sporting full protruding gable roofs and double height bay windows, along with distinctive features such as brick quoins and render. These properties are also notable for their subservient catslide type roof to the side of the protruding frontage gable that again echoes the neo vernacular design aesthetic that likely inspired these dwellings originally.
6. The proposals before me appear to be the result of significant negotiation between the Appellant's and the Council and it appears that some considerable improvement upon the original plans may have now been arrived at. Nevertheless, I am required to deal with the proposal before me as it stands through these proposals bearing in mind all the evidence before me as well as that gathered on my site visit.
7. In summary the proposals intend to extend the property to the side, over the location of the existing garage which would be demolished. This would be supplemented by a change to the front gable roof to a hip with accommodation within the roof and a large single and first floor extension to the rear so as to create dining and kitchen extension with bedrooms above. The proposal would also render over the brick quoin details and remove the existing red brick chimneys.
8. To the rear the extension would extend beyond the existing extensions of both the neighbouring properties but would nevertheless conform to the maximum recommendations within the Council's Supplementary Design Guidance for Residential Extensions. Despite this the proposal would be located towards the south west of the neighbouring property at number 51. Number 51 already appears to have a single storey rear garage extension that protrudes outward from the rear elevation of the property. Number 51 also has a similar fenestration pattern to that of the appeal property in having two windows on the first floor here, one of which is obviously a bathroom and one of which is, presumably, a bedroom.
9. This proposal would be located towards the south east of number 51 and as such I give special consideration to the impact that this specific orientation may have upon the living conditions of residents at number 51. The proposal would for instance introduce a much higher scale of development along this boundary and, due to the orientation and depth of the two storey element of the extension, I consider that there would be some harmful impact upon sunlight and outlook from this neighbouring property as a result.
10. Although the 45 degree rule appears to have been conformed to, there would still be some considerable loss of daylight through the proposed first floor extension both into the first floor window of number 51 and into the garden area, especially in the afternoon and even more so in winter. Moreover, when combined with the blank elevation here and the proposed dormer window to the second floor, I consider that the harm here would be significant and that the proposed extension would appear overly dominant.
11. As such, and contrary to the Planning Officer's conclusion on this matter, I find that the living conditions of neighbours would actually be adversely affected both through the dominance of this extension and through the impact of it upon number 51 through the orientation and siting of the two dwellings. This

would in turn lead to a detrimental and overbearing impact upon the living conditions of neighbours at number 51 Suffolk Road.

12. In terms of the impact of the proposal upon the streetscene, it is apparent that great lengths have been gone to in order to minimise the impact of the proposed extensions, especially to the front. However, the proposal does still noticeably alter the character of the original property, primarily through the loss of locally distinct features that I consider are important in maintaining the character and appearance of the streetscene.
13. The removal of the front gable, brick quoin details, and the brick chimneys for instance would all contribute to a harmful erosion of this distinctive character. Although many of these changes could be undertaken without the need for planning permission, I consider it unlikely that such changes would occur without the rest of these extensions being implemented, and as such I can give this fall back position only limited weight.
14. On balance therefore there would be some modest harm sustained to the streetscene through the cumulative loss of such important details even though the overall form of the extensions would be largely appropriate when seen from Suffolk Road itself. This loss of detail however added to the scale of development and the harmful rearwards projection contained within this application would lead me to the conclusion that such harm is significant.
15. In light of the issues identified above therefore, I consider, on the whole, that the proposed extensions would represent an overdevelopment of this plot that would have a harmful impact upon the living conditions of neighbours and a more modest impact upon the streetscene through the loss of architectural details that I consider are important in this context. As such I conclude that the policy recommendations outlined in Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy, Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Plan and D1 of The London Plan which seek to protect both the character of an area and the living conditions of nearby residents have not been fully met.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR