



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2024

by J N Seymour BA (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02.05.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/23/3335690

53 Moat Drive, Harrow, HA1 4RY

- 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 Bernie Fitzpatrick against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref: P/2362/23, dated 27 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 28 September 2023.
 - The development is described as: Alterations and extension to roof to form end gable; rear dormer; two rooflights in front roofslope; single storey rear extension; first floor side extension; external alterations (demolition of shed).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 'Alterations and extension to roof to form end gable; rear dormer; two rooflights in front roofslope; single storey rear extension; first floor side extension; external alterations (demolition of shed)' at 53 Moat Drive, Harrow, HA1 4RY. This is in accordance with the terms of the application, P/2362/23, dated 27 July 2023, subject to the conditions set out below:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location plan; KS/2022/01; KS/2022/02; KS/2022/03; KS/2022/04; KS/2022/05 REV A; KS/2022/06 REV A; KS/2022/07 REV A; Reasonable Exemption Statement.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details/samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details/samples.

Main Issue

2. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling in a residential street characterised by semi-detached dwellings, many of which have been extended

in various ways over time. The development was refused on the grounds of the first floor side extension and the hip-to-gable roof extensions being excessively wide, bulky and dominant in the street scene. The Council has raised no concerns with the proposed dormer window or the enlarged single storey rear extension and I agree that both of these elements of the development are acceptable.

4. An existing two-storey side extension was previously added on the forwardmost part of the side elevation with a hipped roof that is set down from the original hipped roof of the dwelling. There is a single storey side extension to the rear of the two-storey extension that wraps around the corner onto the rear elevation of the dwelling.
5. The appeal proposal involves constructing a first floor side extension behind the existing two-storey side extension. The proposed first floor side extension would not protrude beyond the existing two-storey side extension, sitting behind it neatly, filling in the unused space above the single storey side extension. The bulk, scale and height of the proposed hip-to-gable extension and first floor side extension would be acceptable because it would be set down from the main ridge line of the semi-detached properties to ensure a subservient appearance in the street scene.
6. Whilst the massing of the dwelling would be increased, it would not be to unacceptable levels in this context as only partial views of the first floor side extension and hip-to-gable extension at certain angles would be available in the space between the appeal site and the neighbour at 55 Moat Drive behind the existing two-storey side extension. The first floor side extension and hip-to-gable extension would be constructed within the original plan depth of the dwelling and do not extend beyond the existing rear elevation, except for the single storey element which the Council agrees is acceptable. The appeal proposal would therefore accord with Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) ('DMP') in terms of being an acceptable size and scale in this context.
7. The amount of space between the dwelling and its neighbour at number 55 would remain the same, therefore the extensions would not create a terracing effect that the Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010) ('SPD') seeks to avoid in determining side extensions to semi-detached dwellings. Furthermore, I observed on my site visit that other hip-to-gable and first floor side extensions have been successfully added to the semi-detached dwellings in the street without materially harming the street scene.
8. Concluding on this issue, I consider the appeal proposal is also a development that would respect the host building, has due regard for street hierarchy and responds to local distinctiveness through its layout, scale and appearance. Consequently, in addition to being in accordance with Policies DM1 A., DM1 B. of the DMP and SPD, the appeal proposal is also compliant with Core Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) Policy D3.D of the London Plan (2021) and the high-quality design aspirations of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

9. The appeal proposal is subject to standard conditions requiring that works are commenced within the statutory three-year time period, that it is constructed

in accordance with the approved plans and that sample materials are agreed with the Council prior to development commencing.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be allowed and planning permission is granted.

J N Seymour

INSPECTOR