



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2021

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 FEBRUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/21/3284437

59 Canons Drive, Edgware HA8 7RG

- 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 David Hughes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/2371/21 dated 3 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is the installation of three automatic rising bollards at entrance to driveway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the Canons Park Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a large, detached dwelling set back from the road frontage by an established and well landscaped front garden with paved central drive and hardstanding area with in / out access. It lies within a predominantly residential area characterised by similar large properties set within similarly well landscaped plots. These are located behind wide grass verges which contain mature trees within the street scene. The appeal site lies at the western end of the road opposite part of the grounds of the North London Collegiate School where the road frontage is more enclosed by high hedges located on the roadside edge. The Canons Park lies to the west of the appeal site where the frontage is more open.
4. The appeal site and the area surrounding it is within the Canons Park Estate Conservation Area (CA). The relevant Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2013) (CAAMS) notes that "*The Canons Park Estate CA is an outstanding area given its special landscaping, openness and good architecture. It comprises a large part of the original Cannons Park estate including the Grade II listed mansion dating back to 1747 and surrounding landscaping.*" It goes on to state "*This landscaped setting lends a special soft, informal and in places, particularly along Canons Drive, a soft, verdant ambience.*" The CAAMS goes on to describe the area as having a sylvan character created by the landscaping that remains including the avenue of trees and grass verges along Canons Drive. Canons Drive is also the original main spine route and follows the former carriage drive to the former mansion

- house. The house (now part of the school) and the remaining landscaped park gardens are also a Registered Park and Garden.
5. The proposed bollards would be sited on the edge of the driveway at the boundary of the property, two along the frontage of the eastern access and one along the western access. The bollards would be 0.5 metres in height and approximately 115 mm in diameter of black finish with reflective band at the top. The Appellant states that they would only be raised at certain 'peak' times of the day to prevent turning within the driveway entrances and at night time to prevent unauthorised access.
 6. The proposed bollards would introduce somewhat alien and incongruous features in the street scene. I agree with the Council that the bollards are 'urban' in appearance and would thereby appear at odds with the semi-rural character of the street scene and wider CA. I consider that such features by reason of their design and appearance would be inappropriate within the essentially soft and natural character and appearance of the CA as described above. Whilst noting that they are not intended to be permanently raised, this could be difficult to enforce.
 7. The proposal would thereby fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Canons Park Estate Conservation Area. This would conflict with Policies CS1.B and CS1.D of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), Policies DM1 and DM7 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) and Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) which seek to ensure that development responds positively to local context and where affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance by being sympathetic to the asset's significance and appreciation within their surroundings.
 8. It would also be contrary to the aims of the CAAMS and the Council's Residential Design Guide (2010) which seek to ensure that development respects and harmonises with the character of the area.
 9. The Appellant has drawn my attention to the bollards that have been installed along the frontage of the nearby Canons Park and school grounds. These items of street furniture are not particularly sympathetic to the character and appearance of the CA particularly given their siting and materials. However, the Council contends that such features would have been considered in the context of the public benefits arising. Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that where a proposal results in less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset, that harm should be weighed against the public benefits. In this instance, whereby the proposal would result in less than substantial harm, no public benefits have been identified. I note that the proposal is intended to prevent unauthorised access and turning at the appeal site and to improve security at the property itself. However, I do not consider that such benefits are sufficient to outweigh the harm identified.
 10. Overall, therefore, for the reasons set out, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR