



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2019

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3233188

8 Chartwell Place, Harrow HA2 0HE

- 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 Mrs Lorna Acikalin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/0188/19, dated 26 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 21 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a wooden shed that has already been installed in a front garden (as we don't have a back garden).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I could see from my site visit that the shed had already been erected in accordance with the submitted plans. I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Roxeth Hill Conservation Area (CA) and the effect on the setting of the locally listed Roxeth Mead.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached timber outbuilding located in the front garden of the cottage of 8 Chartwell Place. The dwelling forms part of a short terrace of cottages attached to the larger Victorian Villa of Roxeth Mead. It is accessed via a private drive off the historical nodal route of Middle Road into the modern housing development at Chartwell Place of approximately seven large detached dwellings.
5. The appeal site is located within the CA, significant for its topography of upper reaches with commanding views and irregular street patterns. The CA is characterised by a rich tapestry of built form of Victorian and Edwardian buildings with influences of Arts and Crafts, together with a limited portion of more modern 20th Century development. The appeal site is identified within Sub Area 2 of the Roxeth Hill Conservation Area Appraisal May 2008, and is recognised for its dispersed plan form set back from Middle Road, with a

distinctive landscape greenery providing a softening effect. The appeal site is also designated by the Council as a building of historical and architectural interest as it is included on their local list.

6. The landscaped gardens to the front of the cottages extend to the back of the footpath and are visibly open in nature due to the picket perimeter fence that allows clear views across the garden to the terrace. The openness of the site contributes to its character and appearance.
7. It is evident that the shed is not visible from beyond the site. However it is particularly noticeable within Chartwell Place due to its size and location at the edge of the site, although the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Design Guide 2010, recommends that outbuildings are located away from boundaries by at least 2m. Whilst it is timber in material and is painted a muted tone, its presence disrupts the openness of the green space to which it is located, appearing as an incongruous and uncharacteristic feature in its environment. The proposal does not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.
8. Furthermore, the shed sits in-front and close to the main elevation of the cottage as a stand-alone structure. Due to its prominent location and scale, this significantly detracts from the terrace that retains much of its historical integrity. The proposal therefore causes harm to the setting of the locally listed building. I recognise that the appellant may have limited outdoor space, however the use of a woven fence to enclose part of the shed would detract from the open character that the garden contributes to. Thus, the harm to the CA would, to which I attach great weight, in my view, clearly outweigh the modest public benefits put forward by the appellants. Overall, the development does not make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness and neither enhances or preserves the character or appearance of the CA, or the setting of the locally listed heritage asset.
9. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the adopted 2012 Harrow Core Strategy Policies CS 1 (B) and (D), and Policies DM1 and DM7 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013; and London Plan Policies 7.4B, 7.6B and 7.8 (C) and (D). Collectively, among other things, these policies seek new development to respond positively to the local and historic context, through a high standard of design with regards to scale, massing, proportion, siting and spacing to protect the built and historic environment. The proposal would also not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) paragraph 196 as the less than substantial harm that I found would not be outweighed by public benefits of Framework paragraph 197 given the harm that I have identified to the significance of Roxeth Mead.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has brought to my attention a number of outbuildings and other structures at Chartwell Place, notably the timber shed to the front of No 9. This shed has no planning history and is the subject of an enforcement matter. Furthermore, I do not have sufficient information before me about the shed at 1 Roxeth Mead to be able to directly compare it to the appeal scheme.
11. Looking at the other structures within Chartwell Place, I do not consider these are directly comparable to the appeal site. They consist of modest outbuildings

located within enclosed gardens that are largely screened from view and are well assimilated into the street scene, or, as with No 6, this is a physical extension to the dwelling that complements the host dwelling. In the case of the detached garages located to the front of dwellings, these are characteristic of the housing development, and likely to be part of the planned estate.

Conclusion

12. I have concluded that the development does not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA and its presence detracts from the setting of the non-designated heritage asset. For these reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR