

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2017

by M C J Nunn BA BPL LLB LLM BCL MRTPI

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

Decision date: 6th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/17/3166664

1 Hallam Gardens, Pinner, HA5 4PT

- 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 David Reese against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref: P/5144/16, dated 1 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as: "garden room".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for a garden room at 1 Hallam Gardens, Pinner, HA5 4PT, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: P/5144/16, dated 1 November 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 916/02, Location Plan.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building, including in terms of brick colour, bonding and pointing mortar.

Procedural Matter

2. The development applied for has already begun, although the scheme has not been completed. The retention of a use or development is not development as defined in the relevant planning legislation. Therefore, I have considered the appeal on the basis of the original description of development given on the planning application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling on a corner plot at the junction of Hallam Gardens and Grimsdyke Road. It falls within the Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area. Built on the 'garden suburb' model, the area comprises interwar 'cottage style' houses set on generous plots. The dwellings are predominantly brick-faced with pitched roofs and front gables. Although

there are variations in the designs of houses, the locality retains an overall consistency in architectural style and building form, and exhibits a strongly cohesive character. Many of the front gardens have mature trees and established shrubs which enhance the setting of the houses. The grass verges to the roads and the mature street trees enhance the verdant and spacious character of the area.

5. There is already an existing two sided wall abutting the house, enclosing an area to the side of the property. Appearing to be of some age, this wall already extends to the side boundary and has a door within the front elevation providing access to the garden. In my judgement, the raising of the height of this wall by about 0.4 metres, constructing a flat roof and a rear elevation would have a very limited impact on the Conservation Area, and would not harm it. The existing wall already effectively encloses the area to the side of the house, and so the scheme would not create a significantly greater sense of enclosure than currently exists. When observed from public views, the limited additional height, new flat roof and rear elevation would not appear prominent or dominant in the street scene. Although the Council has raised concerns about the colour of the bricks used in the works already undertaken, a condition can be attached to any permission to ensure that materials match the existing building.
6. As the proposal falls within the Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area, the relevant legislation requires that special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing its character or appearance. Against this background, I consider that the proposal would preserve the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. There would be no conflict with Policy CS 1 of the Core Strategy which resists proposals that would harm the character of suburban areas or the significance of heritage assets. It would also comply with Policy DM 1 and DM7 of the Development Management Policies. Together, these require proposals to achieve a high standard of design, having regard to the local character and pattern of development, and require the preservation, conservation or enhancement of heritage assets. The scheme would also accord with Policies 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan which have similar aims.
7. Given that development has already started, a standard commencement condition is unnecessary. A condition to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary for certainty. A condition requiring materials to match those in the existing building is necessary to safeguard the character of the building, and the wider Conservation Area. Subject to these conditions, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Matthew C J Nunn

INSPECTOR