
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2017

by Andy Harwood CMS MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 06 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N5660/W/17/3179278
21 Garrads Road, London SW16 1JY

- 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 Iqbal Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lambeth.
 - The application Ref 16/06288/FUL, dated 4 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as “alterations to front boundary structures”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to front boundary structures at 21 Garrads Road, London SW16 1JY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/06288/FUL, dated 4 November 2016.

Main Issue

2. Whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Streatham Park and Garrads Road Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal site faces onto Garrads Road which forms the western boundary to the CA. Garrads Road is described within the Council’s draft Conservation Area Statement¹ (CA statement) as the spine of the CA. Although the document is not adopted, its description of the current character and appearance of the CA conforms largely to what I saw when visiting the site. I can give it a modest degree of weight in terms of its useful description and analysis of the area, although I acknowledge that there are some elements of the architectural descriptions that are not agreed by the appellant.
4. Garrads Road includes mainly large, detached dwellings which are prominently positioned facing towards Tooting Bec Common which adjoins the western boundary of the CA. The dwellings vary in form and size as well as architectural styling and the use of materials with diverse colours. Boundary treatments along front and side boundaries also vary substantially in terms of heights, form and use of materials. I need to consider the effect on the CA as a whole and the CA statement acknowledges there is a range of boundary treatments. Historic front boundaries have rarely been retained.
5. As one turns into Garrads Road from Tooting Bec Road, the street-scene on

¹ Draft Streatham Park and Garrads Road Conservation Area Statement

one side is dominated first of all by a high brick wall and then by a high random light coloured stone wall with a 'crazed' facing, concrete capped piers and ornate gates. This wall returns for a substantial distance into Prentis Road. The modern buff or grey coloured, flat roofed brick building on the corner of Prentis Road at No 23 has a simple, low timber rail with landscaping behind and then there is a contrast with ornate detailing and materials at No 23 but with a simple timber fence at the front. To the north beyond the appeal site on the corner of Becmead Avenue there is a substantial wall with high brick piers with scalloped walls between, with some railings and also with hedging behind. Further along still another property has differently proportioned brick piers and walls with railings between and ornate high metal gates.

6. The side roads also vary in terms of boundary treatment and include strong features such as the high buff coloured brick wall to the side and rear of the appeal site, within Becmead Road. Generally however, there is a smaller scale to the boundary enclosures along the side roads which reflects the tighter grain of development in those areas.
7. The height of the wall is somewhere between, relatively speaking, that of the boundary treatments of the properties on either side of the appeal site. In this regard, the wall does not appear incongruous. The marble facing of the wall and piers is of a similar dark reddish hue as the brickwork on the front gabled section of the dwelling and as used in other nearby walls. Given the general variety of colours of materials throughout the CA, I did not find the colour to be out of place. The marble does have a polished sheen and smoothness to its surface but I did not find that this had a significant effect upon the appearance of the wall. The 'bottle' balustrading is not a common feature nearby although similar detailing already appears on the front of the dwelling. Attention is drawn to these due to the bright colour and this may dull in time and when new landscaping behind is allowed to grow up providing a background to them. Although not common place these features along with the metal gates involve simple ornamentation which has occurred elsewhere in a different forms and little impact upon the CA as a whole. The gates are ornate with differing coloured detailing but again in my view this does not look out of place.
8. The development is set within an eclectic mix of boundary treatments in the CA. Some criticism has been levied at the development due to the quality of how it has been constructed but it is not my role to judge construction standards. This is not a factor to which I give much weight. In relation to the main issue, the front boundary structure preserves the character and appearance of the CA. This would comply with policies Q2, Q11, Q15 and Q22 of the Lambeth Local Plan².
9. The Council has not suggested any planning conditions. Given that the development is very close to completion, no planning conditions are necessary.

Conclusion

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

A Harwood

INSPECTOR

² Lambeth Local Plan, adopted September 2015