
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2016

by George Arrowsmith BA, MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 16 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/16/3160681

8 Broadmead Close, Pinner, HA5 4PS

- 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 & Mrs J & M Chapaneri against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3316/16, dated 8 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey side to rear extension, formation of patio and steps to rear (demolition of single storey side extension).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side to rear extension, formation of patio and steps to rear (demolition of single storey side extension) at 8 Broadmead Close, Pinner, HA5 4PS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/3316/16, dated 8 July 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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: C236-101 Rev A, C236-105 Rev A, C236-106 Rev A, C236-115 Rev A, C236 116 Rev A & C236-121 Rev A.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would be harmful to the appearance of the parent house and the street scene and would fail to preserve the appearance of a conservation area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house in the Pinnerwood Park Conservation Area. The conservation area is an early 20th Century garden suburb type residential development with tree lined streets, grass verges and well-spaced cottage style houses. I have not been provided with a copy of the Pinnerwood Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (the Appraisal) but the officer's report on the current application quotes paragraph 8.23 as saying "*Prior to the conservation area designation, unsympathetic infill*

development and large side extensions unbalanced the intended form of some of these buildings and so led to the erosion of gardens by encroaching on the boundaries of the plots concerned. It is therefore crucial that alterations and extensions harmonise with not only the property that they propose to adjoin but also the neighbouring property as they will also affect its character”.

4. The officer’s report also tells me that the Appraisal notes that, to ensure that the character of the conservation area and its setting is both preserved and enhanced, all new development should respect the existing layout and historic form of the townscape and streetscene and not diminish the gap between buildings. This advice appears to be slightly in conflict with the further quoted advice that development should not entail side extensions that significantly reduce the gap between buildings. This further advice implies that reductions in gaps between buildings might sometimes be acceptable provided the reduction is not significant.
5. The appeal property already has an existing single storey extension on the side nearest the neighbouring detached house at No 9. This extension is about 2.6m wide (the officer’s report says 2.57m whereas the appellant says 2.4m) and set back 5.7m from the house’s front elevation. The proposed replacement would (by the Council’s calculation) be 3.15m wide and be set back 4.45m from the house’s front elevation. The extensions have similar heights at their outer walls but the proposed extension would have a flat roof while the existing extension has a monopitch roof which rises to meet the parent house’s side elevation.
6. The Council do not object to the difference in roof style and their concern about the effect on the appearance of the parent house seems to relate primarily to the way the house and extension fit into the street scene. My view is that this replacement of one set back side extension by another slightly wider and slightly further forward side extension would have no materially harmful impact on the appearance of the house when considered as a building in isolation. It is however also necessary to consider the wider issue of the effect of the proposal on the street scene and the conservation area. This is largely dependent on the effect of the proposal on the perceived gap between No 8 and 9.
7. The existing gap between Nos 8 and No 9 is wider than that between any of the other houses in Broadmead Close. Whilst the appeal proposal would reduce this width the reduction would be limited and the gap would still be wider than all the other gaps. In addition the way the gap is perceived is affected by the fact that the appeal property sits at an angle to the turning circle at the head of the Close so that neither the existing nor the proposed extensions are, or would be, prominent elements in the street scene. Whilst I fully support the objective of avoiding developments that significantly reduce the gap between buildings I consider that the circumstances of this particular case are such that no significant harm would be caused by the changes resulting from the appeal proposal. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the appearance of the parent house or the street scene and would not fail to preserve the appearance of the conservation area. As such I am satisfied that there would be no conflict with the objectives of policies 7.4B, 7.6B and 7.8C&D in the London Plan(2016) policies CS1.B and CS.1D in the Harrow Core Strategy(2012) or policies DM1 and DM7 in the Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013).

8. Since the Council have not objected to any other elements of the proposal I allow the appeal.

Conditions

9. I have imposed standard conditions governing the beginning of development, approved plans and matching materials. These are necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of visual amenity.

George Arrowsmith

INSPECTOR