



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2022

by A. J. Boughton MA(IPSD), Dip.Arch, Dip.Conservation, RIBA MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 FEBRUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3289091
14 Bede Close, PINNER, HA5 4TP

- 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 and Mrs Lubega against the decision of The London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/2961/21, dated 16 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension with pitched roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and whether it would preserve or enhance the Pinnerwood Park Conservation Area (CA), a designated heritage asset.

Reasons

3. Bede Close forms part of the Pinnerwood Park Conservation Area, an area of early C20 housing designed to 'garden suburb' principles where the continuity of building types within a street layout characterised by verges, trees, intermittent open spaces and hedges is of significance. The adopted Harrow Residential Design Guide (RDG) and Pinnerwood Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (CAAMS) provide guidance at a detail level for alteration and extensions dwellings, requiring such attention in order to preserve or enhance the CA.
4. No. 14 is a semi-detached dwelling which retains its original symmetry of form and appearance with its pair, No.12. Both dwellings have rear single-storey extensions and No.14 has a detached garage, which is well set back between the host dwelling and No.16 and not prominent in the street scene. Importantly, along with other examples, the dwelling pair retain the original main roof forms which CAAMS identifies as one of the unifying features and therefore of significance to the character and appearance of the CA.
5. Relevant council policies, including CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) (HCS) and DM1(B) of the Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) (DMPLP) allow the extension of dwellings whilst requiring high design quality

but, in DM7 of the DMPLP, give 'priority over other policies in the DPD' to the conservation or enhancement of a heritage asset.

6. The proposal involves a number of elements. The proposed alterations to incorporate the garage as living accommodation, works to the single-storey rear extension or inserting small, traditionally detailed, rooflights in rear roof slopes could, by careful choice of materials and appropriate detailing, have a result which would not significantly detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling and, therefore, would not diminish the significance of the CA.
7. However, the first-floor extension and additional large gable would introduce a higher order of change widely visible at the rear and that would unbalance the current, and largely typical, symmetrical roof form of the dwelling pair causing moderate harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. As I have indicated, consistency of roof form is a matter of significance to the CA and any harm to that characteristic should attract significant weight. I therefore conclude the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the setting of the Pinnerwood Estate Conservation Area and thereby conflict with Policies CS1 (of the HCS) and DM1 (of the DMPLP) and thus with the Development Plan taken as a whole.
8. I note the appellant has sought to engage with the Council to produce a high quality design. I also note comments as to other cases and nearby extensions, however, neither precedent nor the absence of objection from neighbouring occupiers may displace the duty identified in the NPPF to consider whether a specific proposal would preserve or enhance the significance of a designated heritage asset. I have also considered that the proposal would provide additional living accommodation but this does not change my overall conclusion that, taking all matters raised into account, the appeal must fail for the reasons given.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR