



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2023

**by Felicity Thompson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 31 July 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/C/22/3300821**

**42 Corringham Road, Wembley HA9 9PU**

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Murali Pujari against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
  - The notice was issued on 5 May 2022.
  - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the installation of a door and windows to infill the recessed entrance porch at the front of the premises.
  - The requirements of the notice are to:  
STEP 1 Remove the door and windows to the recessed entrance porch at the front of the premises and restore the recessed entrance porch back to its original condition before the unauthorised development took place.  
STEP 2 Remove all items, materials and debris, arising from compliance with Step 1, from the premises.
  - The period for compliance with the requirements is four months.
  - The appeal is proceeding on the ground set out in section 174(2)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed, the enforcement notice is upheld and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

### The appeal on ground (a) and the deemed planning application

2. The main issue is whether the door and windows preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Barn Hill Conservation Area.
3. As set out in the Barn Hill Conservation Area Character Appraisal (the Appraisal) the Conservation Area is a consistently residential area, the character of which is derived from its hillside setting and layout, as much as from a wide variety of designs which have a distinctive mock-Tudor character.
4. The Conservation Area was originally designated due to the architectural qualities of the houses within it. Whilst they are built to a variety of designs, there is a degree of consistency because of the use of similar building materials, similar overall sizes, and architectural details. The Council stated and I observed, that recessed entrances are a characteristic feature of many houses in the Conservation Area.
5. The appeal property is a detached house with mock-Tudor character, which has been sympathetically extended and makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

6. Notwithstanding the use of timber, the door and windows subject of the appeal, have a basic appearance which is not in keeping with nor complements the style of the house. Moreover, their insertion has resulted in the enclosure of the original and characteristic recessed entrance porch, along with the loss of detailing including mock-Tudor timber brackets/corbels.
7. Whilst the original door and windows have been retained, the overall effect is a modern entrance that does not respect the architectural quality of the house. As such, the door and windows adversely affect the character and appearance of the house and therefore do not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
8. The appellant referred to and provided photographs of dwellings along Corringham Road where porch extensions have been built or whose porches have been enclosed in various manners. However, the Council stated that those alterations, with one exception, which is subject to enforcement action, were carried out prior to the introduction of the Article 4 Direction.
9. It is recognised in the Conservation Area Appraisal that in a number of cases the recessed entrance porches have been in filled in an unsympathetic manner, damaging both the character and design of the houses, and in turn the street scene.
10. However, the slow degradation of the architectural qualities of the area by such unsympathetic alterations, does not justify granting planning permission in the context of the special attention that must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area as a whole.
11. Given the scale of the development within the context of the Conservation Area as a whole, I consider the harm to be less than substantial. Nevertheless, I am mindful that the National Planning Policy Framework says great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset and any harm to such assets should require clear and convincing justification.
12. Where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of such an asset, that harm should be weighed against the proposal's public benefits.
13. In this case reference has been made by the appellant to the security benefits. Whilst I have some sympathy with the appellant and acknowledge the advice from police officers, since there is no substantive evidence that the appeal scheme is the only means by which the desired security could be provided, this is a matter of limited weight.
14. Consequently, the public benefits do not outweigh the great weight that I am required to attach to the heritage asset's conservation. Overall, I conclude that the development does not accord with the design and heritage protection aims of Policy DMP1 and Policies BD1 and BHC1 of the London Borough of Brent Local Plan 2019-2041 Adopted February 2022 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021.
15. Together these policies require high quality design which sustains and enhances the significance of heritage assets. It also fails to accord with national policy which seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment, and the Barn Hill Conservation Area Design Guide which states that the replacement of

canopies with enclosed porches or infilling of recessed entrances or porches with extra door sets will not be permitted.

**Conclusion**

16. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice and refuse to grant planning permission on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

*Felicity Thompson*

INSPECTOR