



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2019 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

**Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2019

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3232674**

**Wellswood, Park View Road, Pinner HA5 3YF**

- 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 G Kannan against the decision of the London Borough of Harrow.
  - The application Ref P/0811/19, dated 20 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 April 2019.
  - The development proposed is a part single storey part double storey side/rear extension, roof extension and patio extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure

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

### Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
  - Whether the proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and development plan policy;
  - The effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt;
  - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the Pinner Hill Estate Conservation Area;
  - if the development would be inappropriate, whether the harm to the Green Belt by way of inappropriateness and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify it.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

*Whether the development would be inappropriate development*

4. Paragraph 145 of the NPPF states that new buildings are inappropriate in the Green Belt unless they fall within the given list of exceptions. One exception is
-

- the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.
5. Policies DM17 and DM16 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (the 'local plan') and policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy are broadly consistent with the NPPF although there is no specific reference to the extension and alteration of a building in the Green Belt. The explanatory text at paragraph 5.8 of the local plan however does state that proposals for the extension and alteration of existing dwellings in the Green Belt will be assessed in accordance with the NPPF and Policy 7.16 of the London Plan.
  6. The proposal would comprise a number of extensions at ground, first and roof level to the rear and at both sides including the creation of three rear balconies and external alterations to the existing rear dormer, a single storey front porch infill extension, a raised patio at the rear and the installation of rooflights to the front and rear roof slopes. The proposal would also result in the removal of the existing chimneys.
  7. The appellant has provided detailed calculations of the footprint and floor area increases over the original dwelling and states that the proposal would represent a 60% increase in footprint and a 122% increase in floor area. The Council has not provided me with corresponding calculations but they consider the extensions are not proportionate. There is no defined way of assessing and measuring proportionality, but the NPPF refers to 'size'. This can, in my view, refer to volume, height, external dimensions, footprint, floorspace or visual perception. In this case, the increase in floorspace, depth, width at first floor, and, in places, height of the dwelling would result in a considerably greater visual bulk. Therefore, I find that the scale of the extensions would subsume the original dwelling and would be disproportionate.
  8. The appellant contends the increases would be proportional and refers to other development in the area. However, the case referred to relates to the erection of two dwellings so is not a comparable form of development and is assessed under different criteria. In any case, each proposal should be assessed on its own merits and this is the approach I have adopted.
  9. On the basis that the proposed extensions would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling, I therefore find the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would conflict with Paragraph 145(c) of the NPPF, as detailed above, and policies DM16 and DM17 of the local plan, policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy, and policy 7.16 of the London Plan which together seek to resist inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

### *Openness*

10. Openness is identified in the NPPF as one of the Green Belt's essential characteristics. The increased volume as a result of the significant extensions would have an adverse effect on the openness of the Green Belt in a spatial sense. Furthermore, the increased width of the proposed first and second floors, plus the prominence of the dwelling in the street scene, means the proposal would also have a greater visual impact on the openness of the Green Belt when seen from Park View Road. The spatial and visual impact on openness would result in significant harm to the Green Belt.

11. Substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt. Development should not be approved unless the harm to the Green Belt, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. I therefore need to consider whether any other harm is caused by the development and then balance the other considerations against the totality of that harm.

*Character and appearance*

12. The appeal site is located in an area characterised by large detached dwellings in verdant and spacious surroundings, within the Pinner Hill Estate Conservation Area. Its special interest is derived from its wooded and tranquil atmosphere, and low-density development. The urban form of the area is of high architectural quality, with a mix of styles from Arts and Crafts, to Art Deco and Tudor Revival. The neighbouring house to the east of the appeal property is a locally listed building known as 'Naseby', which contributes positively to the significance and character of the Conservation Area because of its Tudor Revival design.
13. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. In this respect national policy on heritage assets, which includes conservation areas, is set out in the NPPF. At paragraph 192, it sets out matters which should be considered including sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. Paragraph 197 states that the effect of development on non-designated heritage assets should also be taken into account.
14. The extensions, in particular the bulky first floor side additions, would not complement the proportions of the existing house. Furthermore, by virtue of the scale of the side extensions, the proposal would reduce the visual gap between the existing property and the neighbouring dwellings which would reduce the spacious character of the area. Indeed, due to their size, height and proximity to the boundary, the extensions on the eastern flank of the building, would reduce the spacious gap to the locally listed building known as 'Naseby', which would negatively impact on its setting. In addition, although the appellant states that the three crown roofs would replicate the roof design of the property known as 'Sunder Nivas', on the opposite side of Park View Road, I find that those proposed would appear excessively large and would dominate the street scene.
15. Also, although the appellant states that chimneys are not a predominant feature of the area, I observed many properties in the vicinity featured chimneys, including the neighbouring properties known as 'Fairway' and 'Naseby', directly adjacent to the appeal site. The Pinner Hill Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2009) highlights that chimneys are important design features which contribute to the Arts and Crafts character of the area. The removal of the distinctive chimneys would thus damage the architectural integrity of the property and harm the wider character of the Conservation Area.
16. I also find that the proposed insertion of four rooflights within the roof slope of the front elevation would damage the appearance of the appeal property and the street scene.

17. The proposal would therefore fail to preserve the character and appearance of the dwelling and the Pinner Hill Estate Conservation Area. It would conflict with policy DM1 of the local plan and policies 7.4(B) and 7.6(B) of the London Plan which together seek to ensure proposals are well designed and contribute positively to the character and appearance of the surrounding area in which they lie. It would also conflict with policy DM7 of the local plan, policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy, the Pinner Hill Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2009), the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, and guidance in the NPPF which together seek to ensure heritage assets are preserved and enhanced.

*Other considerations*

18. The NPPF states that inappropriate development should not be approved except in very special circumstances, and that very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. In this regard, I have not been provided with any other considerations which weigh in favour of the development.

**Planning Balance and Overall Conclusion**

19. I consider that the development causes harm to the Green Belt by way of its inappropriateness and to its openness, and substantial weight should be given to these harms. It also would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the dwelling and the Pinner Hill Estate Conservation Area and although the harm to the heritage asset is less than substantial, as noted above, there are no benefits which would outweigh that harm.

20. I conclude that there are no other considerations that clearly outweigh the harms and therefore there are no very special circumstances to justify the development. Consequently, the development conflicts with Paragraph 145(c) of the NPPF, and policies DM16 and DM17 of the local plan, policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy, and policy 7.16 of the London Plan which together aim to protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development.

**Recommendation**

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

*Thomas Courtney*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

**Inspector's Decision**

22. 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