



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2025

by **N Armstrong BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/25/3364597

The Old Bakery, Grange Court, Grange Gardens, Pinner, Harrow HA5 5QB

- 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 Archie Mesgian against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/3392/24.
 - The development proposed is proposed additional external parking space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on road user safety and active and sustainable travel, with particular regard to layout and parking provision; and
 - whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Pinner High Street Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

Road user safety and active and sustainable travel

3. The appeal site comprises three dwellings, The Old Bakery (Unit 1), Mews Lodge (Unit 2) and Barns Lodge (Unit 3), situated to the rear of properties on High Street and Grange Court. These units are served by three parking spaces, including one in a garage attached to Mews Lodge, with the two other spaces and the area in front of the garage delineated from other hardstanding by block paving. A second garage adjoins that adjacent to Mews Lodge, which is outside of the appeal site. Access to the site is taken from Grange Gardens, between residential properties on Grange Court and 2 Grange Gardens.
4. The plans show an increase from three to four spaces for the three dwellings at the site. The new space would be located partly in front of the garage immediately adjoining Mews Lodge. Whilst it may not be uncommon for parking to be provided on a driveway or hardstanding to the front of a garage serving the same property, this area is not identified as a parking space in the current parking arrangements. Therefore, it provides space for drivers of vehicles turning and manoeuvring around the site, particularly those using the garages, enabling them to exit onto Grange Gardens in a forward gear.

5. Whilst I did not observe vehicles in the area at my site visit, evidence from an interested party provides photographs of various vehicles parked sporadically in the overall area of hardstanding. I have limited further information to demonstrate that this is a regular occurrence or that there are specific issues in terms of congestion. However, based on the information before me and my observations on site, I cannot be certain that the proposed layout would not result in conflicts in terms of access to and from existing parking spaces and that this would not impact on the ability of drivers to safely manoeuvre vehicles within the site and onto the highway.
6. The overall thrust of policies in The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (2021) (the LP) and the Harrow Council Development Management Policies (2013) (the DMP) is to minimise parking provision and encourage the use of other forms of transport. The site is within Outer London and has a public transport access level of 3 where a maximum of three parking spaces should be provided for the existing dwellings, and this is the current provision on the site.
7. The proposed additional parking space would lead to the maximum parking standards allowed by development plan policies being exceeded. Although the appellant states that it is intended to assist in relieving parking pressures in the area, there is limited evidence that these exist to the extent that a further space would be justified. The site is served by sufficient parking to meet current development plan standards, and the proposal would undermine its aim to promote active modes of travel and the use of public transport.
8. Accordingly, due to the increase in parking provision and the proposed layout, I conclude that the proposed development would not promote active and sustainable travel, and it has not been demonstrated that it would not harm road user safety. This conflicts with Policies T6 and T6.1 of the LP and Policies DM1 and DM42 of the DMP. Amongst other things, these policies set out maximum parking standards and require development to provide safe internal circulation and safe access to and from the public highway.

Character and appearance

9. The proposal would result in the loss of a small, grassed area to the front of Mews Lodge to create an additional parking space for that property. The plans indicate that other existing landscaping around the site would be retained.
10. The Pinner High Street Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2009) (the CAAMS) highlights that the CA is a remarkable survival of a medieval village with a wealth of historical built fabric of significant interest, which illustrates its historic evolution. Elements of open space also enhance the area's character, and pockets of green openness help to maintain a unique village feel within otherwise urban environs. From the evidence before me and my observations on site, the significance of the CA is founded on its architectural and historic interest.
11. The dwellings at the appeal site are more modern in appearance compared to other traditional buildings within the CA and the hardstanding between these and the rear of Grange Court is already a predominant characteristic of the site. Given the more modern structures, extent of hardstanding and its location to the rear of the more traditional buildings facing Grange Gardens and High Street, the appeal site does not display the same village characteristics as other parts of the CA that contribute more positively.

12. Some parts of the appeal site can be viewed down its access from Grange Gardens. At the time of my visit there were no cars parked at the appeal site and the existing areas of hardstanding were a notable feature alongside some of the elevations of the dwellings. There would be clear views of parked cars to the side of Barns Lodge at times when the existing spaces are in use. The small, grassed area that would be lost to the proposal is visible from Grange Gardens to a much more limited degree, even with no cars parked. Other existing planting in the area shown to be retained growing up alongside the elevations of Mews Lodge is a more attractive landscaping feature of the site.
13. Alongside the existing planting in the area to be retained, the grassed area helps to soften and provide some visual relief from the larger expanse of hardstanding within the appeal site itself. I have had regard to the CAAMS, which sets out a presumption against proposals for infilling of private open space and natural gaps between buildings. This also looks to encourage the retention of private green spaces and to retain or increase soft landscaping where possible.
14. Given its location and size, the grassed area is not a significant feature of the site and it makes a limited contribution overall to the character and appearance of the wider area and the significance of the CA. Whilst there would be a minor and localised effect within the site itself, the loss of this area to facilitate a new parking space adjacent to the more prominent parking spaces within the site would not unacceptably detract from the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, there would be no harm to the significance of the CA.
15. I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character or appearance of the CA, and therefore, it would not conflict with Policies D3 and HC1 of the LP and Policies DM1 and DM7 of the DMP. Amongst other things, these look to ensure development conserves the significance of heritage assets by being sympathetic to the assets' significance and appreciation within their surroundings, and resist development that is detrimental to local character and appearance. The development would also comply with the National Planning Policy Framework where it requires consideration to be given to the impact of a proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, and great weight to be given to the asset's conservation.

Other Matters

16. Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, special regard must be given to the desirability of preserving the building, or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. The barn to the south of 38 High Street, a Grade II listed building, is to the south-west of the appeal site. Due to the separation distance and the intervening buildings, the proposal would preserve the setting of the listed building.

Conclusion

17. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Armstrong

INSPECTOR