



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2022

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1ST July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3295061

5 Woodhall Gate, Pinner HA5 4TN

- 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 Jouanneau against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/0011/22, dated 4 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 5 Woodhall Gate, Pinner HA5 4TN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/0011/22, dated 4 January 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL – 01 and PL – 02 Rev A.
 - 3) Other than on the proposed roof, the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area, including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that in respect of development affecting conservation areas, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing their character or appearance.
4. The National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework') states at section 16 that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets such as conservation areas, and that harm to their significance should require clear and convincing justification.

5. In requiring proposals to conserve the significance of heritage assets, Policy HC1 of The London Plan 2021 ('LP') and Policy DM7 of the Harrow Development Management Policies 2013 ('HDMP') are consistent with that approach.
6. The site falls within the Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area ('PPECA'). As described in the Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2009, the area is characterised by low density, artisan housing, on tree lined streets, in a landscaped setting. The Appraisal notes the continuity of building types and materials, with many semi-detached 'cottage style' houses arranged in a 'T' or 'H' shaped plan form. It refers to the importance of those shapes to the area's character and appearance.
7. The host forms one half of a two storey semi-detached pair. The building's style, form and architectural detailing, including feature brickwork, steeply pitched roofs with clay tiles, and a pronounced overhang at the eaves, are typical of this distinctive area, and it thus contributes to the PPECA's significance.
8. To the rear, the pair has a two storey projection which forms part of No 5. In that regard, it contrasts with the other pairs in the row just to the north which have twin rear gables and therefore display greater symmetry. Additionally, I observed that part of the space to the rear of No 3 has been infilled with a conservatory.
9. The proposed single storey rear extension would alter the host's footprint. However, its staggered rear and side elevations would give it an indented shape which would, to a significant degree, respect the host's original plan form, and would limit the extension's apparent scale and mass. Additionally, given that the scheme would be single storey only, with a low parapet roof, the original building's form would still be clearly legible.
10. Moreover, the proposal has been carefully considered to replicate or respect much of the design detailing in the original building. That includes a brick on edge parapet, black rainwater goods, brick soldier courses over openings, and matching windows. The overall result would be a high quality design, which would not harm the character and appearance of the host property, or the significance of the PPECA.
11. Thus, the scheme would not conflict with LP Policy HC1 and HDMP Policy DM7, nor with the Framework's stance on conserving and enhancing the historic environment. Given that it would be to a high design standard, and would respond positively to local distinctiveness and character, the scheme would not conflict with LP Policy D3, HDMP Policy DM1, or Policy CS1 Part B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012.
12. With reference to paragraph 6.59 of the Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2010, given the specific site considerations and context here, along with the scheme's limited height and its appropriate design, the extension's depth would be acceptable. The appeal will therefore be allowed.
13. The Council has not suggested any conditions, but having regard to the Framework's tests, I have imposed the standard time limit condition and, in the interests of certainty, a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Finally, other than on the discrete roof

area, where a flat membrane is proposed, in the interests of good design, a matching materials condition is necessary.

14. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR