
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2020

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3244043

2A Woodhall Drive, Pinner HA5 4TQ

- 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 Michael Captieux against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3587/19, dated 14 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is conversion of loft by raising the existing roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The significance of the CA lies in the prevalence of attractive early C20 domestic architecture and the generally low-density layout of housing often located on tree-lined streets. Dwellings are predominantly two-storey in height and whilst there are a mix of styles, a common characteristic on many of the dwellings is front projecting gables with similarly angled pitched roofs. Such roof forms are prevalent on the side of Woodhall Drive on which the appeal dwelling is located. No 2A is a corner dwelling which incorporates gabled projections set down from the main ridge. The angle of the roof pitches on its gables is consistent with those on the gables of neighbouring dwellings. The shared attributes and the regular rhythm of gabled fronted dwellings positively contributes to the character and appearance of the CA and adds to its significance.
4. The proposed roof extensions would remove the existing articulation in ridge heights. The angle of the roof pitches would be steeper than those generally seen in the CA. This would be emphasised on the gabled projections which would be seen by passers-by on Woodhall Drive to contrast with the angle of roof slopes on neighbouring gables. Consequently, the gabled roofs would appear incongruous within the street scene and would detract from the shared attributes and the continuity in roof forms which forms an integral part of the character and appearance of the CA.

5. My attention has been drawn to other gables in the area that have roofs which sit level with the main ridge serving those dwellings. However, in those particular instances, the gables are wider and the roof pitches are similarly angled to those seen on narrower gables in the area that are more often set down from the main ridge of dwellings. Therefore, the examples provided do not persuade me that the steeper pitched gables on the appeal proposal would be in keeping with other gabled projections in the CA.
6. The appellant contends that facing brickwork detailing would replicate the pattern and materials of the existing dwelling. Even so, this would not disguise the incongruity of the roof form proposed.
7. Paragraph 193 of the Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). Paragraph 194 of the Framework states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.
8. Given that the proposal relates to the roof of a single dwelling in the CA, the development would result in less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the CA. Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. However, the site is already in its optimum use as a dwelling and the only benefit in this instance would be a private benefit in terms of the additional accommodation provided for the appellant. Therefore, the harm identified is not outweighed by public benefits in this instance.
9. I conclude, the development would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. In that regard, the development would conflict with the parts that seek to respond to local architectural character and conserve the significance of heritage assets in Policies 7.4 (Local Character), 7.6 (Architecture), 7.8 (Heritage Assets and Archaeology) of The London Plan (2016), Core Policy CS 1 (Overarching Policy) of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), Policies DM 1 (Achieving a High Standard of Development) and DM 7 (Heritage Assets) of the Harrow Development Management Policies (2013).

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out, the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR