

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 August 2023

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2023.

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/23/3323239

2 Snaresbrook Drive, Stanmore, Harrow, HA7 4QW

- 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 Prakash Sohan against the decision of Harrow Council.
 - The application Ref P/0805/23, dated 15 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is a part single and part double storey side and rear extension, part single storey front extension, rear dormer and three roof lights to facilitate a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single and part double storey side and rear extension, part single storey front extension, rear dormer and three roof lights to facilitate a loft conversion at 2 Snaresbrook Drive, Stanmore, Harrow, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/0805/23, dated 15 March 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: SD2-03-1002 Rev A.
 - 3) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no windows/doors other than those shown on the approved plans shall be installed in the east facing flank walls of the development hereby permitted.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on the character and appearance of the area; and the effect on the amenities of neighbouring residents.

Reasons

3. The proposal would replace the existing single storey side garage with a two storey side extension. This would be set back from the frontage and would be relatively narrow in form compared to the width of the house overall. The
-

property adjoins the rear boundaries of the houses on Court Drive. The nearest property, number 24, has large trees in its rear garden. Views of the extension would therefore be limited and in any event, the proposed frontage would have a subservient but complementary appearance to that of the existing house.

4. The ground floor elements of the new works to the side and rear would not be evident in public views. The two storey element, although extending beyond the rear building line would similarly be largely screened. Although the proposal includes a large rear dormer window, this would be set comfortably within the much larger area of roof and would also not be evident from public vantage points. Given the design of the elements of the proposal that would be visible within the public domain, including the new front entrance area, the proposal would be in keeping with the design of the existing house and would not have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the area. The design of the elements to the side and rear would be of a suitable design standard, in keeping with the existing property detailing.
5. The works overall would result in a significant increase in the size of this dwelling. It sits within a relatively large plot and would retain a significant garden area. It would not appear cramped or overdeveloped. Overall, it would not conflict with the design requirements of policy CS 1(B) of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012 or policy DM 1(A & B) of the Harrow Development Management Policies 2013 (DMP). The proposal would also accord with policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 which sets out guidance with regard to optimising site capacity.
6. The proposal would not conflict with the guidance set out within the Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide 2010 as the proposed dormer appears to fall within the specified set backs within the rear roof slope; the side extension would remain appropriately set back; and the rear extension would be in a position and of a height, that meets the requirements for two storey rear extensions.
7. Concerns have been raised with regard to the impacts on neighbouring residents. The single storey elements replace an existing side and rear extension. The rear extension would be six metres deep along the shared boundary. However, this would be an addition of two metres compared to the existing. The neighbouring property has a similar rear extension and as such only the additional two metres would extend beyond it. Although more imposing and reducing outlook, its impact would be relatively limited and would not unacceptably harm the living conditions of the neighbouring residents.
8. The two storey and single storey side extensions would be close to the rear boundary of the neighbouring properties in Court Drive. However, the two storey element would be set away from the boundary and beyond the vegetation within the nearest gardens. The addition would not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of those residents with regard to outlook or loss of light. The two storey element would also be sufficiently set away from the boundary with 4 Snaresbrook Drive to avoid unacceptable impacts on outlook or increased shading. The rear dormer would allow for direct line of sight from the second floor bedroom into the neighbouring garden. However, it would not result in a significant loss of privacy given the similar views already available from the bedroom below.

9. Concerns have been raised with regard to increased parking requirements as a result of the increase in bedrooms. The driveway would continue to be able to accommodate a number of vehicles and this provision would remain satisfactory for a dwelling of this nature. Many of the concerns raised, including those associated with the garden rooms that do not form part of this appeal, appear to relate to the potential for the property to be used for purposes other than a single dwellinghouse. This proposal does not propose a change of use and as such must be considered on its merits. Reference has also been made to the potential for builders to work during antisocial hours. However, the council has specific powers under other legislation to deal with noise and environmental nuisance.
10. The council has suggested conditions which would prevent windows being inserted into the side walls after these works are complete; and to prevent the use of the flat roof of the extension as a first floor terrace. There is no reason to believe that the extension roof would be used as a terrace and it would, in any event, need consent for some form of enclosure to make it safe. I have however, imposed the suggested condition to control the insertion of side facing windows or doors in order to protect the amenities of the residents of the neighbouring properties. Subject to this condition, the proposal would satisfy the amenity requirements of DMP policy DM 1(C). As the policies referred to by the council generally accord with both the design and amenity requirements of the *National Planning Policy Framework*, I afford them full weight.
11. In conclusion, although the works would result in a larger house with improved accommodation, it would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the dwelling or the wider area. It would also not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents. Whilst I have had regard to the concerns raised, I have not found there to be any matters that weigh significantly against the proposal. I therefore allow the appeal.
12. I have imposed conditions relating to the commencement of development and the details of the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. The plans set out the details of the materials to be used so no further condition in this regard is necessary. I have imposed a condition requiring that permission be required for any flank windows/doors as discussed previously to ensure that the amenity of the neighbouring residents would be protected.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR