

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 November 2024

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/24/3351601
48 Clifton Road, Kenton, Harrow, HA3 9NS

- 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 Vekaria against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/0888/24.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. One of the Council's reasons for refusal related to flood risk. The appellant has submitted information to indicate that this is a matter that could have been resolved by way of a planning condition and there is no substantive information before me to the contrary.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 50 Clifton Road, with regards to outlook.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey terraced dwelling located in a residential area characterised by the presence of two storey terraced and semi-detached dwellings of similar appearance.
 5. Houses in the area are set back from the road behind short parking areas and have long gardens to the rear. During my site visit, I observed the surrounding area to have a sense of uniformity, derived from the similar design of dwellings, the common use of brick, render and tiles, the prevalence of hipped roofs of the same height and the regular setting-back of dwellings.
 6. I also noted during my site visit that many dwellings have been altered and/or extended and that such changes generally appear in keeping with host dwellings and the surrounding area.
 7. The appeal dwelling has an existing single storey extension to the rear. The proposal would project considerably further to the rear than this existing
-

extension. Like the existing extension, it would extend across the majority of the width of the dwelling.

8. The proposal would result in a tall blank wall projecting along the shared boundary between the appeal dwelling and its attached neighbour, Number 50 Clifton Road, for some considerable distance. I find that the height of the proposal would combine with its projection and most notably, its immediate proximity to this neighbouring property, such that it would appear to loom above the shared rear boundary to an overbearing degree.
9. I find that the harm arising from this would be exacerbated by the presence of an existing rear extension to Number 52 Clifton Road, which extends considerably to the rear along that dwelling's shared boundary with No 50. The proposed development would combine with No 52's existing extension to result in a "corridor" effect, such that the outlook from the rear of No 50 would be unduly dominated by the presence of tall and lengthy projections in immediate proximity to either side of its garden.
10. This would result in a harmful sense of enclosure, detracting significantly from the rear outlook from No 50.
11. Taking the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 50 Clifton Road, with regards to outlook, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; Core Strategy¹ Policy CS1; to DMP² Policy DM1; and to the Council's Residential Design Guide³, which together amongst other things, seek to protect residential amenity.

Other Matters

12. In support of his case, the appellant refers to the outcomes of other planning appeals. However, these relate to other proposals elsewhere in the locality. Notwithstanding this and whether or not there are any similarities between proposals the subject of other appeals and that the subject of this appeal, I have found that the proposal before me would result in significant harm and this is not something that is mitigated or changed by the presence of other developments elsewhere.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

¹ Reference: Harrow Core Strategy (2012).

² Reference: Harrow Development Management Policies (2013).

³ Reference: Harrow Supplementary Planning Guidance Residential Design Guide (2010).