

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3240436

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 Jignesh Chapaneri against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/1557/19, dated 25 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 August 2019.
 - The development is the replacement of the front windows from single glazing to double glazing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeals Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The application was submitted retrospectively, and I saw at my site visit that the windows had already been installed. I have therefore considered the appeal on this retrospective basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in a cul-de-sac within the Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area (the Conservation Area), which is a designated heritage asset. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended, requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. The significance of the heritage asset, in my view, stems from the uniformity of the architecture and materials in the dwellings, and this is prevalent in this discrete cul-de-sac. The similarity in the design of the dwellings in the Close, including the appeal property, makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area.

6. The replacement first-floor oriel window on the front elevation of the appeal property is the same shape and size as the original window and the oriel windows of other neighbouring dwellings, including the attached neighbouring property, No.7 Broadmead Close. However, its appearance is somewhat different, with wider corner posts and narrower central window panes. Although the differences are subtle, it gives the window a more modern appearance and is out of keeping with all the surrounding properties. Its contrast with the corresponding window in the attached dwelling at No.7 is particularly stark. The window has a less delicate form than the others within the area, with a bulky and incongruous appearance which has a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the cul-de-sac and the Conservation Area.
7. I conclude that the development fails to preserve the character and appearance of the Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area. Therefore, it conflicts with Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of The London Plan (2016), Policy CS1B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and Policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies (2013) which collectively seek to ensure development is of a high standard which enhances the public realm. It also conflicts with policies 7.8 C and D of the London Plan, CS1D of the Core Strategy and DM7 of the Development Management Policies, which seek to ensure development responds positively to historic context and conserves and enhances heritage assets. The proposal is also contrary to the heritage objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') and the SPD 'Pinner Conservation Areas' (2009) which states that the cumulative impact on small scale alterations, such as window or door replacement, can severely detract from the character and appearance of conservation areas.
8. The harm is relatively small scale in the wider context of the Conservation Area and therefore, having regard to the Framework, the harm to the significance of the Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area is less than substantial. The Framework requires, where there would be less than substantial harm, for it to be balanced against the public benefits of the scheme. The replacement of the windows from single glazing to double glazing provides no public benefit and therefore this does not outweigh the less than substantial harm to the heritage asset previously identified.

Conclusions and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR