

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2017

**by D Boffin BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI Dip Bldg Cons (RICS) IHBC**

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

**Decision date: 23 May 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/17/3167042**

**2 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 Nigel Allery against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
  - The application Ref P/3617/16, dated 25 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 October 2016.
  - The development proposed is described as "*demolition of existing garage and part rear and part side extension including the slight increase in the width of the front paving area and resurfacing with block paviors*".
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area (PPECA).

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is within PPECA and from the details available to me I consider that the significance of PPECA is largely drawn from the suburban housing that it contains together with the use of materials, pattern of development and the relationship of buildings to the spaces around them. The part of PPECA in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site is characterised by detached and semi-detached dwellings set within generous plots. Any garages are in the main set back an appreciable distance behind the front elevations of the dwellings.
  4. The Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2009) (CAAMS) for PPECA states that the original form of the dwellings and the spacing of garages is important to the historical character of the area. It highlights that one of the pressures and issues within PPECA is that a significant proportion of its garages have been lost to habitable rooms. This puts pressure on open passageways between the house and garage and increases the chances that residents will keep bins in their front gardens.
  5. The proposal would involve the demolition of the existing garage and the construction of a single storey extension to the dwelling that would wrap around its rear corner. The extension would not project any further forward than the existing garage but it would infill the passageway and it would be deeper than the existing garage. The extension would also be appreciably taller than the garage as there would be a parapet detail to the flat roof. I acknowledge that the existing gate between the garage and dwelling means that the passageway isn't entirely open visually. However, there are views
-

- above the gate and the lack of built form to its rear is plainly discernible from Broadmead Close.
6. I note that the garage doors would be retained on the front elevation but the increase in height with the additional brickwork to the parapet detail would exacerbate the extension's bulk emphasising the infilling of the passageway and it would visually compete with the attractive canopy over the main entrance. Even though the entrance door to the extension would be slightly set back from its front elevation I am not convinced that it would satisfactorily offset the additional height and the infilling of the passageway. Consequently, the visual separation and openness between the garage and the house would be substantially eroded.
  7. Moreover, the extension would project further into the garden than the existing garage and this factor in combination with the wrap around the rear elevation and the additional height at the rear due to the ground levels would result in a disproportionate addition when viewed from the garden. It would also erode the characteristic form and layout of the dwelling. Furthermore, the 3 existing bins, that were stored at the rear of the garage at the time of my site visit, would more than likely have to be stored within the front garden area as the only access to the rear garden would be through the extension.
  8. Despite the use of sympathetic materials the siting, design and overall size and scale of the extension would result in a discordant and unsympathetic extension that would erode the distinctive layout and form of the area and host dwelling with consequent harm to the character and appearance of PPECA.
  9. The appellant has drawn my attention to an extension at 4 Broadmead Close (No 4). I noted at my site visit that it appears that a number of garages have been converted to habitable accommodation and infill extensions built between the houses and the garage within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. Whilst these are now part of the character and appearance of the area they do not justify a further erosion of the significance of PPECA. Moreover, the extension at No 4 was approved before the CAAMS document was adopted. In any case, I am required to determine the appeal on its own merits.
  10. Taking into account all of the above the proposal would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the PPECA and would cause less than substantial harm to its significance as a heritage asset. There are no public benefits to outweigh the harm caused. I have attached considerable importance and weight to the desirability of avoiding any such harmful effect in accordance with section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
  11. On this basis, it would conflict with Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan, Policies CS1 of the Core Strategy, Policies DM1 and DM7 of the Development Management Policies, the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document and the CAAMS. These policies and guidance together seek high quality design that is informed by the surrounding historic environment, conserves and where appropriate enhances the character and appearance of heritage assets and that extensions should respect their host building.

### **Conclusion**

12. For these reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*D. Boffin*

INSPECTOR