



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2023

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/23/3329342

20 Georgian Close, Stanmore HA7 3QT

- 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 Ms Kun Liu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/0847/23, dated 19 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extension to raise roof height; three rear dormers; rooflights in front roofslope; two storey front extension incorporating porch; front entrance canopy; single storey front garage extension; single and two storey rear extension with conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations and extension to raise roof height; three rear dormers; rooflights in front roofslope; two storey front extension incorporating porch; front entrance canopy; single storey front garage extension; single and two storey rear extension with conservatory at 20 Georgian Close, Stanmore HA7 3QT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/0847/23, dated 19 March 2023, 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: 22-20HA73-200-P1; 22-20HA73-101-P2; 22-20HA73-101-P2; 22-20HA73-110-P2; 22-20HA73-111-P2; 22-20HA73-200-P1; 22-20HA73-200-P1; 22-20HA73-201-P3; 22-20HA73-202-P3; 22-20HA73-203-P3; 22-20HA73-210-P3; and 22-20HA73-211-P3.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. Reference is made in the Council's second reason for refusal to insufficient information being provided to assess the proposed raising of the appeal property's roof height within the context of the adjoining properties and the wider streetscene. Although such information has been submitted as part of the appeal and has been considered, the assessment which has been

undertaken primarily relies upon the information which was available to the Council in the determination of the appeal application.

Main Issues

3. It is considered that the main issue were the effects of the proposed development on (a) the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene and (b) the living conditions of the occupiers of 21 Georgian Close.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. A The appeal property is an already extended detached dwelling situated at the end of a cul-de-sac located within a primarily residential area. The road is fronted by a range of differently designed dwellings with no coherent character and appearance other than they are generally 2-storeys in height and set back from the footways to the rear of front gardens which are landscaped and used for parking. Adjacent to the appeal property hipped roof forms predominate.
5. The proposed development includes several extensions to the front, side and rear of the property, including a single storey front extension. This extension would increase the depth of the existing garage thereby enabling an internal reconfiguration of the habitable accommodation. It is this element of the appeal scheme which is the subject of a specific objection from the Council as expressed in the first reasons for refusal.
6. From what was observed, the property is sited rearwards of 19 Georgian Close because of the turning head. Views from the east along Georgian Close towards the proposed enlarged garage would be limited by No. 19 and the means of enclosure along the shared front boundary. Where views would be available close to the turning head, the enlarged garage would be viewed against the scale and massing of the host property, No. 21 and the trees forming part of the shared boundary with No. 21.
7. Accordingly, although a front extension, the proposed enlargement of the garage would not be so conspicuous or obtrusive so as to adversely affect the character and appearance of the varied streetscene. There would remain a landscaped front garden associated with the property and the pattern of development in the streetscene would not be disrupted by the proposed single storey extension. These considerations reflect the guidance for front extensions contained in the Council's *Harrow Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)*.
8. Further, when assessed against the size of the existing host property, and as it is proposed to be altered, the enlarged garage would not represent a bulky addition, particularly where it is the width rather than depth of this detached dwelling which is noticeable from the road. As sought by the SPD's guidance, this element of the appeal scheme would relate to, and complement, the existing architectural design and, subject to a suitable condition, the materials of the host property.
9. There would be an increase in the ridge height of the property to enable habitable accommodation to be created within the roofspace. The enlarged property would still have the appearance of a 2-storey dwelling notwithstanding the proposed rooflights within the front roofslope. The proposed roof

alterations would not alter the hipped roof form and would not significantly affect the appearance of the property which are considerations raised in the SPD.

10. From what was observed, there are variations in the height of roofs along the road which has a slight incline from east to west. The resulting property would not be materially taller than No. 21. The proposed ridge of the roof would be higher than No. 19 but because of variations in the siting of this neighbouring dwelling and the appeal property, the enlarged property would not be conspicuous within the streetscene.
11. In the Planning Officer's report further concerns are raised about the design of other elements of the appeal scheme, including the height of the rear extension and the siting of a dormer. However, these matters do not alter the assessment which has been made.
12. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene and, as such, it would not conflict with Policy CS.1B of the Core Strategy (CS) and Policy DM 1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (DMP). Amongst other matters, these policies require development to be of high quality design which is not detrimental to local character and appearance and for extensions to respect their host buildings. Policy D3 of The London Plan is more particularly directed at optimising site capacity through a design-led approach rather than being a detailed development management policy for householder extensions.

Living Conditions

13. DMP Policy DM 1 refers to the consideration the adequacy of light and outlook within buildings (habitable rooms and kitchens) and outdoor spaces. There is guidance contained in the SPD stating that extensions should not cause any unreasonable loss of light or overshadowing to any habitable rooms and kitchens in neighbouring properties. To assist in assessing a scheme, there is also guidance that no part of any new extension should interrupt a 45° splay drawn on plan from the nearest first floor or 2 storey front or rear corner of any next-door dwelling. This guidance is referred to in DMP Policy DM 1.
14. Based upon the appellant's sun path diagram analysis, the proposed extension to enlarge the garage would interrupt the plane of a 45° splay drawn from the closest corner of No. 21 and the nearest ground floor window within the front elevation of No. 21. However, for the second window serving the same ground floor habitable room at No. 21 such an interruption would not occur. Although the 45° plane would be interrupted, adequate sun and daylight would still be able to reach the ground floor habitable room of No. 21.
15. Further, the outlook from the 2 windows of No. 21 would primarily remain towards the extensive front garden with the vegetation along the shared boundary visually breaking-up the side elevation of the proposed garage extension. The slope of the proposed extension would also be angled away from the boundary reducing its visual and physical bulk. For these reasons, there would not be an unacceptable sense of enclosure for the occupiers of No. 21 associated with this element of the appeal scheme.

16. Although there would be some overshadowing and loss of outlook, the degree of change would not amount to unacceptable harm being caused to the occupiers of No. 21. Accordingly, on this issue it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 21 Georgian Close and, as such, there would not be a conflict with CS Policy CS.1B and DMP Policy DM 1, including ensuring that there is a high standard amenity and development not being detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Conditions

17. Consideration has been given to the conditions suggested by the Council which have been assessed against the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance. A condition requiring the garage to be erected in accordance with the submitted drawings is necessary for reasons of good planning and for the avoidance of doubt. A condition requiring external materials to match the host property is necessary to assist with the assimilation of the resulting property into the streetscene.
18. For the reasons given, it is concluded that this appeal should be allowed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR