



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2023

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/23/3316249

16 Langton Road, Harrow HA3 6QN

- 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 O Al-Tarehi against the decision of Harrow Council.
 - The application Ref P/3330/22, dated 21 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as a wrap-around single storey extension which consists of a side extension and a 6 metre rear extension, including the removal of the existing rear extension and a side canopy roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a wrap-around single storey extension which consists of a side extension and a 6 metre rear extension, including the removal of the existing rear extension and a side canopy roof at 16 Langton Road, Harrow HA3 6QN, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/3330/22, dated 21 September 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: site location plan at 1:1250 scale and drawing nos. AR 01, AR 02, AR 03, AR 04, AR 05, BP 01 and BP 02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and the area; and
 - the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to the outlook from, and availability of natural light to, 14 Langton Road ('No 14') and 18 Langton Road ('No 18').

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The Harrow 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. Its paragraph 6.66, which is referred

to in the Council's delegated report, concerns roof alterations, and is therefore of limited relevance to the matter before me. However, at paragraph 6.59 it sets out that the acceptable depth for single storey rear extensions will be determined having regard to permitted development criteria, and to a consideration of the site and its context.

4. The host forms one half of a semi-detached pair, which sits amongst a row of similar properties on the southern side of Langton Road. The front face of the proposed wraparound extension would be low and narrow, and it would appear similar to other subordinate side extensions in the streetscene.
5. I observed that some of the houses in this row, including No 12, have single storey rear extensions, or outbuildings. At around 6 metres deep, the proposed rear extension would be larger than the rear extension it would replace. However, notwithstanding that significant depth, given its limited roughly 3 metre height, and its flat-roofed form, it would be clearly subordinate in scale to the original property.
6. Moreover, its height and form, and the presence of boundary fences, would ensure that it would not be prominent even in views from nearby houses and their gardens. Additionally, its walls would be finished in render similar to the host, which would help to assimilate it into its surroundings.
7. The rear extension would be deeper than generally advised by the SPD. Nevertheless, having regard to the specific site circumstances and context here, the scheme would not harm the character or appearance of the host property or the area. Consequently, on this issue, it would not conflict with Policies D3.D(1) and (11) of the London Plan 2021 ('LP'), Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, or Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Local Plans Policies 2013 ('HDMP').
8. Amongst other things, and in general terms, these require development to achieve a high standard of design which responds positively to local distinctiveness and character; and extensions to respect their host building.
9. Neither would it conflict with the broadly similar requirement for good design which is sympathetic to local character in the National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework').

Living conditions

10. I observed on my visit that the attached neighbour at No 14 has a rear canopy, which provides a semi-enclosed space over its patio. As the proposed rear extension would extend to the boundaries of the plot either side, its side wall would be clearly visible from that patio and from that property's nearest ground floor glazing.
11. However, it would replace an existing extension which is similarly positioned with respect to that boundary. Additionally, it would be taller, but not substantially so, compared to the existing boundary fence, which is roughly level with the top of No 14's canopy roof.
12. In that context, the scheme would not impact the outlook from the house or garden at No 14 to a harmful degree, and for similar reasons, on the basis of the available evidence, I am not persuaded that it would cause those occupiers a significant loss of natural light. Additionally, given the scheme's single storey

height, and having regard to the sun's trajectory, it would not cause them significant overshadowing.

13. Turning to No 18, its side face, which contains just a door at ground floor level, is set in from the boundary with the appeal site. That boundary in this position comprises the side face of the host's existing lean-to extension. Both the host and No 18 have small outbuildings beyond that, but which are close to those dwellings' respective rear faces, and which abut the boundary between them.
14. No 18's nearest ground floor rear-facing habitable room window is set well in from the side boundary, and the outlook from it is mainly down that property's own long rear garden, with views to the right restricted by the presence of those existing features. In that context, and given the proposed extension's flat-roofed form and limited height, the scheme would not have a significantly overbearing impact on the outlook from that property or its garden.
15. Given that No 18 is set in from the side boundary, and has a southerly rear aspect, this single storey scheme would not give rise to a harmful impact on those occupiers due to loss of natural light or overshadowing.
16. I have found that the scheme would be deeper than generally advised by the SPD. However, for all the above reasons it would not impact the living conditions of the adjacent occupiers to a harmful degree.
17. On this issue, it would not therefore conflict with LP Policy D3.D(7), or that part of HDMP Policy DM1, which require development to deliver an appropriate outlook, privacy and amenity, including adequate light, having regard to the prevailing amenities in the area. Nor would it conflict with the Framework requirement to ensure a high standard of amenity.

Conditions and Conclusion

18. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have imposed the standard time limit condition and, in the interests of certainty, a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Also, in the interests of good design, a matching materials condition is necessary.
19. Summing up, the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area, nor impact the adjacent occupiers' living conditions to a harmful degree. Consequently, having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR