



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2022

By A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3305566

48 Canons Drive Edgware HA8 7QY

- 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 Lamba against the decision of The London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref: P/1013/22 dated 10 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 31 May 2022.
 - The development is new security grilles to front façade ground floor windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for new security grilles to three front façade ground floor windows at 48 Canons Drive Edgware HA8 7QY in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: P/1013/22 dated 10 March 2022 and the plans submitted with it subject to this condition:
 - 1) Within 6 months of the date of this decision the security grilles shall be removed and brickwork made good unless the fixing plates thereof, and any related metalwork which extends over the brickwork surrounding the windows, are painted in a suitable colour which has previously been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

Preliminary Issue

2. Although the Council refer to impact on the setting of the Conservation Area, (CA) the appeal site lies within the CA and not its setting, consequently I consider:

Main Issue

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

Reasons:

4. 48 Canons Drive (No.48) is a large detached dwelling dating from the early decades of the twentieth century displaying some arts and crafts influences in its design. It is set back a significant distance from Canons Drive behind a spacious fore garden. The appeal site lies within the Canons Park Conservation Area but is not a listed building or in the setting of such. The Council indicate that, although there are many such within the CA, No.48 does not appear on the local list.

5. Although the Council say the grilles are '*unsympathetic to the special character of the building and..*' it is not clear what that special character (of the building) might be. The character of the CA is set out in the Councils report in so far as it is relevant to the matter to be determined and this frames any assessment of impact arising from the proposal. To my mind the character of the area (and its significance) is sustained in the overall presentation of No.48, a strong architectural form behind its tree'd, and informally laid out, foregarden.
6. The security grilles have been designed such that white metal bars align with glazing bars of the windows behind. Whilst the white fixing plates do identify the presence of the grilles by generating a degree of visual confusion as to the the rectangular outline of the white painted sash windows, the change introduced to the appearance of No.48 is, otherwise, at a nominal level. In addition the grilles are only applied to three ground floor windows. Were grilles to be applied to other windows the concerns of the Council as to a (cumulative) urbanising effect would be justified.
7. Over-painting of the fixing plates in an appropriate colour would ensure the grilles would become barely discernible in the public realm and thereby the impact on character and appearance of the CA and its significance would become negligible. This would align with the purposes of the Article 4 Direction as to preventing harm to character and appearance (of a conservation area) that would arise from cumulative change to the buildings within.
8. Mindful of the duty set out in Section 72 of the Listed Building Conservation Areas Act 1990 to have regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the CA, my observations direct that the works sought to be approved, if subject to a condition as to the colour of the fixing plates, would have no more than negligible impact upon the wider character and appearance of the CA. On that basis I find no conflict with policies DM1 and DM7 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) or the identified CA Management Strategy.
9. I therefore conclude that the appeal should succeed subject to the condition stated.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR