
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2020

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/20/3251046

17 Glanleam Road, Stanmore HA7 4NW

- 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 & Mrs Ketan Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/5227/19, dated 18 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2020.
 - The development is a glass car cover to front drive.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council's decision letter describes the development as retrospective. It is clear from the evidence provided and my site visit that the glass car cover had been erected. I shall determine the appeal on this basis accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the glazed parking structure on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises of a contemporary style detached dwelling located in a mature well-established residential area, typically characterised by large detached properties of varying designs in relatively spacious landscaped plots that provides an open and verdant character to the area. The properties are set back from the road behind a front garden/driveway and grass verge where no footways exist. Where boundary walls and other structures exist in front of the adjacent properties, they are low, clearly subsidiary, and have little impact upon the sense of openness.
5. The development entails the erection of a glazed car parking structure measuring about 2.5m high on the paved hardstanding area at the front of the property. The car cover is predominantly constructed in glass and a powder coated aluminium frame made in segments in an elliptical shape.
6. Although the glazed parking structure is set back from the edge of the carriageway, the scale and non-traditional form of the development

nevertheless results in a significant addition that compromises the sense of space and openness created by the modest boundary treatment and the open plan frontages in this location. These shortcomings are exacerbated by the structure's position, where it is visible from a number of public vantage points along Glanleam Road. As such, I consider the development, by virtue of its scale, siting and design, results in an incongruous and out-of-keeping addition that adversely harms rather than positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.

7. I have considered the appellants arguments that the design and layout of the glazed parking structure has been carefully considered in order to provide an innovative design solution to car security on the site that minimises any adverse impacts on the area. However, whilst the use of materials and the landscaping assists in integrating the development with the area, these aspects do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above.
8. Consequently, I conclude that the glazed parking structure has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It is contrary to the overall aims of Policy 7.4B of the London Plan 2016, Core Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development demonstrates a high quality design that respects and responds positively to existing buildings and the local character and distinctiveness of the area. In addition, the glazed parking structure does not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework that developments should seek to secure a high quality of design (paragraph 124) that are sympathetic to the local character (paragraph 127).

Other Matters

9. I note the appellants comments on the need for additional security as a result of the previous incidents of crime and the steps taken to provide improved on-site security in light of the advice received from the Metropolitan Police. I have considerable sympathy for the appellants circumstances and accept that there are security benefits in having a permanent glazed car structure. However, little substantive evidence has been provided to demonstrate what other security measures have been taken to address these issues and this does not set a precedent for such inappropriate development in this location for the reasons set out above.
10. I have considered the various benefits put forward by the appellants that the proposal would bring, including providing improved security and the scheme's high quality design. While I have given them some weight, these modest benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified. For all these reasons, there are no other material considerations to outweigh the development plan conflicts identified.

Conclusion

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

David Troy

INSPECTOR