



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2020

by R. Jones BA(Hons)DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/20/3252532

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 Harrow Council.
 - The application Ref P/0338/20, dated 29 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'erection of car port and hardsurfacing at the corner of the driveway.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council's decision letter describes the development as retrospective. It is clear from the evidence provided and my site visit that the car port had been erected. I shall determine the appeal on this basis.
3. The Council's Decision Notice refers to a policy from the Draft London Plan 2019 (DLP). In accordance with paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), weight may be given to emerging policies subject to the stage of preparation and extent of unresolved objections. There is little substantive evidence before me which allows me to make this judgement. However, as this plan is at an advanced stage but not yet adopted, I give the policy in the emerging DLP moderate weight as a material consideration.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. No.2A Woodhall Drive (No.2A) is within the Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area (CA). I am therefore required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the CA, in accordance with the statutory duty as set out in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The Pinnerwood Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (December 2009) (CAA) describes the significance of the CA as being largely derived from the low-density housing, tree lined streets and a uniform character with a consistent architectural style.

6. No.2A is a large detached infill house located in a mature well-established residential area, close to the junction of Woodhall Drive and Uxbridge Road. I saw from my site visit that houses on Woodhall Drive generally have a similar building line and architectural style, set back from the road behind a front garden/drive and low boundary fences or hedges. There is a uniform character which is typical within the CA.
7. The proposal is for the construction of an open-fronted car port structure on an area of hardstanding to the front of No.2A broadly parallel with its boundary with Woodhall Drive. Although intended as a 'lightweight' structure, the overall width of the car port would be around 5.5m, to allow for two cars to park. Its substantial size, combined with its location forward of the house and the open frontage to No.2A, means that the car port would be a clearly visible and dominant structure. When viewed from the road it detracts from the attractive appearance of the house.
8. The CAA describes that *'when the estate was laid out, some properties were designed with integral garages as on Evelyn Drive, but on many of the other roads these were built to the side of the house and pushed back to the rear, allowing views through into the garden in the passage between.'* Houses on Woodhall Drive are typical of this character, with garages, usually brick built, set back from the front elevation. Whilst screened to some degree by the existing high hedge on the boundary with Woodbridge Drive, its location and timber construction means the car port would be an incongruous feature that would cause harm to this established character.
9. I saw from my site visit that part of the existing hedge on the boundary of No.2A had been lost. This could easily re-establish itself over time and replanting in this area could have been controlled by condition. Further planting in this area, would not, however, mitigate the harm I identify above.
10. I have noted that another development in the area, at 1 Hallam Gardens, has been drawn to my attention by the appellant. However, the garden room allowed in that case had different development characteristics to the appeal scheme. The proposed garden room was brick built, located adjacent the host house and would be viewed against a backdrop of an existing brick wall. In any event, each proposal falls to be assessed on its own merits. I therefore accord it limited weight as a precedent in this case.
11. Overall, I conclude that the proposed car port would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies 7.4B and 7.6B of the London Plan (2016) (LP), Core Policy CS1(B) of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) (CS) and Policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) (DMP). These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development demonstrates a high-quality design that respects and responds positively to existing buildings and the local character and distinctiveness of the area. Due to the harm caused to the CA, a heritage asset, the proposals would be contrary to LP Policy 7.8, Draft London Plan (2019) Policy HC1 and DMP Policy DM7 as well as the heritage guidance in the Framework.
12. It would also be contrary to the Harrow Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2010) which seeks to ensure new

development is informed by the pattern of development of the area in which it is situated and that car ports integrate into the design of the house.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR