



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2019

by Thomas Bristow BA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/19/3238332

55 Lake View, Edgware HA8 7SA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Carlin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/3095/19, dated 10 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as a 'front single-storey extension to the study'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front single-storey extension to the study at 55 Lake View, Edgware HA8 7SA in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P/3095/19, dated 10 July 2019, subject to the conditions below.

Preliminary matters

2. No 55, likely along with neighbouring Nos 57 and 59, were created following grant of permission in 1986. Those three fall at an easterly reach of the Canons Park Estate Conservation Area ('CA'), which here includes a number of properties along Lake View before reaching the A5. The CA is the subject of the Council's Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Strategy (December 2013, 'CAAMS').
3. There is some planning history to No 55. Nevertheless each proposal must be determined on its merits in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan includes policies of the London Plan ('LP'), the Harrow Core Strategy ('CS') and the Development Management Policies Plan ('DMP').¹ I have also had regard to various other material considerations including the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') and the Planning Practice Guidance ('PPG').

Main issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the host property and that of the CA.²

¹ Adopted in March 2016, February 2012 and July 2013 respectively (notwithstanding a review of the LP presently at examination).

² With regard to Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended.

Reasons

5. Nos 55, 57 and 59 share an access off Lake View. They are well set-back from it, behind a dense bank of mature evergreen trees shown on plan 1608.P2.02 (some of which appear to be protected via Tree Preservation Order). Of those three dwellings, No 55 is furthest back relative to the pavement. There are also several trees close to the garden of No 55, flanking the adjacent path leading to the Lake.³ The property is, by consequence, scarcely visible from most public vantage points.
6. No 55, albeit relatively recently-created, reflects Tudor revival design. That aesthetic, combined with mature trees, reflects characteristics integral to the CA. Paragraph 6.8 of the CAAMS, for example, describes the prevailing Tudor revival architecture to the area and its sylvan setting, albeit I saw how those characteristics are more pronounced around Canons Drive than towards the fringes of the CA.⁴ A common architectural feature is black timber with white render detailing, as is emulated at No 55.
7. Importantly, however, CAAMS paragraph 6.62 explains that the individual detailing of properties varies despite a broadly common style. There are, for example, significant variances in the amount, or even presence, of white render from property to property. Nos 61 to 67 nearby, historic properties, feature comparatively limited render of muted sand-coloured above two-storey bay window elements. There is also no white render present at No 70 obliquely opposite. Nos 55, 57 and 59 have been designed with variances in form and appearance; No 59, for example features relatively less render and more brickwork-facing.
8. The extension would affect only a very small proportion of the principal elevation of No 55. It would represent a modest extension in absolute terms, and relative to the scale of No 55 as built. I acknowledge the Council's position that it would reduce the amount of render present. However some would remain. Moreover the scale and design of the extension would otherwise tie-in well with the roof form, detailing, and materials used in the existing property. It would represent a consistent and subservient addition, altering very little the overall appearance of the property (and not in such a way to meaningfully affect its consistency with the prevailing architecture of the CA).
9. By virtue of its limited size, seclusion from public vantage points, and on account of some architectural variety to its surroundings, the proposal would integrate appropriately with the host property and preserve the character and appearance of the CA. That is in accordance with the relevant provisions of LP policies 7.4(B), 7.6(B) and 7.8, CS policies CS 1(B) and (D), DMP policies DM1 and DM7, NPPF paragraph 127, and with regard to the guidance contained in the Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (adopted December 2010, paragraph 6.35 in particular). In summary, and amongst other things, those policies seek to ensure that all development is designed so as to integrate appropriately with surrounding character, including seeking to preserve historic integrity.

³ Part of Canons Park, a Grade II Registered Park and Garden, and of the Cannons Lake and The Basin Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.

⁴ The appellants set out that Lake View is cited on seven occasions in the CAAMS as possessing less strong historic integrity than other areas.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the NPPF, and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions below.

Conditions

11. In addition to securing commencement within the relevant statutory period, I have imposed conditions requiring compliance with the supporting plans and that matching materials approved by the Council are used in the extension as in the existing building. Those are necessary so that the proposal is implemented as assessed above, and thereby integrates suitably with local character and appearance.
12. Given the proximity and value of various trees nearby, to secure compliance with the approach in DMP policy DM 22 and with regard to the duty placed upon me by section 197(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended, condition 5 is necessary to safeguard the wellbeing of trees that may potentially be affected by the development proposed. In imposing conditions I have had regard to the tests in NPPF paragraph 55, the approach in the PPG, and to relevant statute. Accordingly I have modified the wording of certain conditions proposed by the Council without altering their aims.

Thomas Bristow

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved plans 1608.P2.02 and 1608.P2.04.
- 3) 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.
- 4) Notwithstanding conditions 2 and 3, before their installation in the development hereby permitted, samples of the external materials to be used shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The external materials shall be installed as approved, and thereafter retained.
- 5) No works related to the development hereby permitted, other than those relating solely to the fabric of the existing building, shall be undertaken until an Arboricultural Method Statement ('AMS') and Tree Protection Plan ('TPP') have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The AMS, in compliance with British Standard 5837:2012 (or successor document), shall contain full details of methods of demolition and groundworks within the Root Protection Area of any relevant trees,

construction/ creation/ making good of any driveway/ hardstanding (including, where appropriate, the use of a 'no dig' approach and foundation design so as to minimise effects to root systems), and arboricultural supervision/ monitoring arrangements.

The approach approved via the AMS and TPP shall be adhered to throughout the undertaking of the development hereby permitted.