



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2023

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3310155

3 Bromefield, Stanmore, Harrow HA7 1AA

- 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 Kiran Ruda against the decision of Harrow Council.
 - The application Ref P/2759/22, dated 27 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'double storey wraparound extension, new front porch, roof alterations including a loft conversion. (The proposed design is coordinated with a proposed design for No.1 Bromefield in order to achieve similar massing and appearance, including matching ridge heights.)'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a double storey wraparound extension, a new front porch, and roof alterations including a loft conversion at 3 Bromefield, Stanmore, Harrow HA7 1AA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2759/22, dated 27 July 2022, 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 plans: AR-PL-1000, AR-PL-1001, AR-PL-1002, AR-PL-1003, AR-PL-1101 Rev B, AR-PL-1013 Rev B, AR-PL-1102 Rev B and AR-PL-1014 Rev B.

Procedural Matters and Background

2. In the description of this proposal, the appellant refers to a scheme on the other half of this semi-detached pair at 1 Bromefield ('No 1'), with which he states this design has been co-ordinated. That scheme, which is very similar to this one, is the subject of a separate appeal (Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3310151) ('the adjacent proposal').
3. In its decision the Council states that there is no guarantee that the adjacent proposal will achieve planning permission, or that it will be completed. However, I note that both schemes were submitted at the same time and were prepared by the same company; that simultaneous appeals were lodged; that both appeal statements reference the adjacent development; and that both schemes abut the shared boundary. I am dealing with both those appeals, and for the above reasons, I consider that if they are allowed, there is a strong likelihood that both would be implemented.

4. Whilst I have considered the above in my reasoning, in the description of the proposal in my formal decision I have included only those matters which are an act of development.
5. Finally, the Council has not provided me with an officer report for this scheme. I have therefore considered it on the basis of the available evidence including the decision notice, but with reference to the adjacent proposal.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and the area; and
 - the living conditions at 1 Bromefield, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

7. The Harrow Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2010 ('SPD') sets out that extensions should harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original dwellinghouse.
8. The houses on Bromefield are typically detached or semi-detached, with hipped roofs, and display design features such as hanging tiles and full height bay windows. However, I observed that many have been substantially altered, often with large front porches, and two storey side and rear extensions.
9. That includes No 7 and No 11, and the adjacent detached house at No 5, which has a porch similar to that proposed here, along with side and rear extensions, including sections of flat roof. I do not have the full planning history of all those schemes, and some may pre-date the adoption of the SPD, but they nonetheless form part of the area's established and prevailing character.
10. The semi-detached pair at Nos 1 and 3, which sit on a lower section of Bromefield compared to the buildings to the south and have a lower ridge height, largely retain their original proportions. In the context of the area and given the large block of flats at Hertford Court to the north, they appear very modest in scale. That conclusion is supported by the submitted site location and block plan, and by the 'birds' eye view' on the cover of the submitted Design and Access Statement, and its images at Section 3.
11. The proposed two storey side extension would have a hipped roof to reflect the form of the host, its width would be around half that of the host, its first floor would be set well back, and its side wall would step in towards the rear. Its roof would also be set down compared to the proposed raised roof on the main part of the building. It would thus achieve a broadly subordinate appearance.
12. The original property's characteristic double height front bay window would be retained, and the building's walls would be finished in smooth white render, and its roof finished in dark grey roof tiles, to match the adjacent proposal.
13. Consequently, whilst the host's main roofline would be raised, the scheme as a whole would achieve an articulated appearance, which would limit its perceived bulk, and it would respect the broad architectural style of the host. It would

also be more in keeping with the scale and proportions of the generally much larger buildings nearby.

14. Moreover, it would largely mirror the form and proportions of the adjacent proposal. As a result, should that proposal be implemented, this pair would achieve a cohesive appearance.
15. For those reasons, whilst the scheme's scale would not fully reflect the advice in the SPD, the proposal would not appear incongruous in the streetscene, and it would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area.
16. Amongst other things, and in general terms, London Plan 2021 ('LP') Policy D3 Parts D1) and D11), Harrow Core Strategy 2012 ('HCS') Policy CS1.B, and Harrow Development Management Policies 2013 ('HDMP') Policy DM1, require a high standard of design which respects the host building, and responds positively to local character and distinctiveness with regard to matters including scale, appearance, shape, bulk and proportions. The proposal would not conflict with those policies, nor with the National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework') requirement for high quality design which is sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.

Living conditions

17. The SPD states that rear extensions should not cause an unreasonable loss of amenity to neighbouring residents. It continues at paragraphs 6.59 and 6.60 that single storey extensions greater than 3 metres deep may be acceptable in special circumstances; and at paragraph 6.65 that, in order to avoid an overbearing visual impact, two storey rear extensions which abut the side boundary should adhere to the SPD's 45-degree code.
18. Whilst No 1 currently retains its original proportions to the rear, this scheme's form, depth and proportions would be very similar to the adjacent proposal. Consequently, if both were to be implemented, this scheme would have a minimal impact on the outlook from the proposed rear face of No 1 which would continue to be principally down that property's reasonably generous garden.
19. In the unlikely event that the scheme at No 1 is not implemented, there would undoubtedly be a greater impact on those occupiers. In particular, the scheme would be seen to the right from its nearby rear bay windows. However, the principal outlook from those rooms down that property's garden would not be affected. In the context of the area, the limited interruption to those occupiers' outlook would not go beyond what might be reasonably expected in this built-up area. Thus, even in this scenario, the scheme would not impact No 1's living conditions to a harmful degree.
20. Thus, the scheme would not conflict with LP Policy D3 Parts D7) and D10) and Policy D6.B which require development to deliver high quality design, with an appropriate outlook, privacy and amenity, and comfortable and inviting indoor and outdoor environments; nor with those parts of HDMP Policy DM1, which aim to achieve a high standard of privacy and amenity.
21. The Council's decision does not reference any particular part of the SPD or allege a breach of its 45-degree code. However, for the above reasons the scheme would not conflict with its broad stance that rear extensions should not

cause an unreasonable loss of amenity to neighbouring residents. Neither would it conflict with the Framework's requirement to create places with a high standard of amenity.

Conditions and conclusion

22. I have found that the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area; and that it would not harmfully impact the living conditions at No 1.
23. Turning to the matter of conditions, the standard time limit is necessary, as is, in the interests of certainty, a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. As those plans set out details of new facing materials for the original property and the proposed extensions, the Council's suggested second condition requiring that the external surfaces match those in the existing building is neither necessary nor appropriate.
24. For all these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR