

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2017

by R W Allen B.Sc PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/17/3170292

Pangbourne and Yogi Bhavan, Magpie Hall Road, Bushey WD23 1NT

- 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 Messrs Antonio and Shalim Ahmed against the decision of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/5318/16, dated 13 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is removal of existing front boundary, construction of brick wall and metal railing front boundary with sliding and swing gates, removal and re-instatement of adjusted crossovers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council raises no concerns in respect to the repositioning of the vehicular crossovers. As no other representations are before me to the contrary, I am content in my decision to deal only with matters relating to the front boundaries, and I am satisfied no party would be prejudiced by me doing so.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Magpie Hall Road comprises a number of properties on generous sized plots. The respective front boundaries vary, but many that I observed either have open frontages with no or low level walls, or are reinforced with tree or shrubby planting. As such, Magpie Hall Road displays a pleasant verdant character.
 5. Although the presence of taller brick boundaries, railings, and gates would not necessarily be alien features in this area, I find that the size, extent and proximity of the proposed front boundaries to the road would result in a harsh and hardened enclosure of both appeal properties which would be highly prominent and apparent in the road. The set back of the vehicle access gates to both properties would do little to visually relieve what would appear as tall and unrelieved boundary enclosures along not insignificant proportion of Magpie Hall Road.
-

6. I have noted the other forms of boundary treatments which the appellant has drawn to my attention, notably the entrance gate to The Laurels on the opposite side of the road; the lychgate entrance feature to the adjacent property Moorside, and the boundary to Oak Hurst Lodge. However, none that I observed are comparable in size and extent along the boundary as the proposed boundary would be, and I draw little in the way of direct similarities from them. In any event, I have made my decision on the evidence before me.
7. I find the proposed development would notably depart from and cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would not accord with policies 7.4 B and 7.6 B of the London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011) 2016, with policy CS1 B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, and with policy DM1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies 2013, all of which require development to achieve a high standard of design. It would also not accord with the relevant parts of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 2010 entitled 'Residential Design Guide' (SPD).

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Allen

INSPECTOR