



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2022

By A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3306553

9 Caddis Close STANMORE HA7 3TL

- 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 N Istambouly against the decision of The London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref: P/0225/22 dated 24 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 July 2022.
 - The development proposed and in part sought to be approved retrospectively is single storey front extension; Single storey side and single and two storey rear extension; Infilling of lower ground floor at rear and single storey side extension at lower ground floor; Connecting wall, access platform, terraces and steps between the main dwelling and two storey outbuilding (garage/utility) on lower ground and ground floor level; External alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter:

2. The appellant points to the Council's approval ref: P/2860/21 which appears to have been implemented. From my observations this has significantly increased the size of the property at its rear in comparison with what appears on the submitted drawings shown as 'existing'. I have taken this into account in reaching my decision.

Main Issue:

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of 9 Caddis Close and its surroundings, including the effect on neighbouring users.

Reasons:

4. Number 9 Caddis Close (No.9) is a link-detached dwelling of recent construction sitting within a development of similar houses. A feature of the site is the underlying topography which has resulted in a level of accommodation below the entrance level and a built-up parking court giving access to other properties. The forecourt area to the side of No.9 provides access and parking for adjacent dwellings including No.10 Caddis Close (No.10) which not only directly faces the side wall of No.9 but is also attached to its garage. The frontal outlook from No.10 across the parking court is restricted by the now-enlarged No.9.

5. In approach views the gap between No.9 and No.10 is significant in presenting a degree of openness having a southerly prospect, with the boundary between the parking court and the garden to No.9 marked only by picket fencing.
6. The previous grant of permission¹ has significantly increased the bulk and depth of the original house and reduced easterly outlook from the frontage of No.10. In addition to these rear extensions the enclosure of a formerly open-sided porch at the front corner has relocated the entrance door to No.9 such that the main entrance door to the property is now flush with the side wall. From the images supplied, although this recent change would appear to be minor, it has added to the overall sense of enclosure and tightness of the shared access arrangements.
7. Whilst I note the appellant's comments on the effect of the proposal being incremental and located behind the frontage of No.9, the proposed single storey 'side' extension to the kitchen would actually project towards No.10. It would appear as an incongruous addition which significantly intrudes upon the openness of the forecourt, replacing a relatively unobtrusive fence with further built form. Taken with what has already been permitted and constructed, what is proposed would, due to the apparent depth of the host dwelling, disproportionately add to the existing sense of enclosure, further reducing, and tending to dominate, the frontal outlook from No.10 and the already limited sense of space in the parking court between the dwellings.
8. There would, in my judgement, be an unacceptable impact upon neighbouring dwellings as to outlook and openness, detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal conflicts with Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) and the principles set out in the Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guide (2010) which seek to protect the character of suburban areas and the amenity of residents.
9. I therefore conclude that, for the reasons given and taking all matters raised into account, the appeal cannot succeed.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR

¹ P/2860/21