



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2025 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) MIEMA, CEnv

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/24/3355775

6 Old South Close, Harrow, Pinner HA5 4TW

- 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 Premal Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/1882/24.
 - The development proposed is a front porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the Pinnerwood Park Estate Conservation Area (CA).

Preliminary Matter

4. At the time of my site visit, construction work was being carried out at the property.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is located within the Pinnerwood Park Estate CA. I have therefore had regard to Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) which places a duty upon the decision-maker, in the exercise of planning functions, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. The National Planning Policy Framework (the 'Framework') further advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
6. The CA is a cohesive residential development of early 20th century houses. Old South Close is relatively unaltered and has retained an open garden suburb character with a generally consistent architectural style. The appeal property makes a positive contribution to the special interest of the CA due to the retained original design details and high-quality materials.

7. The appeal property is semi-detached and possesses a cohesive design and symmetry with the neighbouring adjoining property (No. 5 Old South Close). The appeal property features a simple timber canopy front porch, a typical and unifying design feature present on the majority of the properties in the Close and surrounding roads. The proposals would replace the existing porch with an enclosed front porch featuring a flat roof and parapet wall design.
8. The porch would be set back from the front and side building line. However, although it would be fairly modest in scale, and it is clear from the appeal documents that much consideration has been given to the fenestration, materials and detailing to match the existing dwelling, it would still significantly alter the appearance of the appeal property.
9. The open driveways at the front of the properties on the Close increase the visibility of the structure, and would disrupt the uniformity with No.5 Old South Close and other dwellings on the Close. The changes to the porch would introduce a more contemporary appearance and the loss of the original porch would detract from the character of the host property and the cohesiveness of the CA as a whole. The development therefore fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. This view is supported by the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy Pinnerwood Estate (Adopted December 2009) (the 'CA Appraisal and Management Strategy') which states it is important for the character of the area that existing original porches are retained, or where necessary replaced in close replica.
10. It is evident that there are existing variations in design details between dwellings, some of which were deliberate features in the original design to add variation and a small number of which are more modern alterations. The appellant has drawn my attention in particular to No. 12 Old South Close and nearby No. 25 Woodhall Road, which have been altered more significantly and both feature enclosed front porches. Whilst the appellant notes that their design is different and is of higher quality, the examples show that enclosed porches do exist in the area. However, these examples are in the minority and reinforce that enclosed porches are not a characteristic of the original properties or a positive aspect of the character and appearance of the CA.
11. For these reasons, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the CA in conflict with Section 72 of the Act. The proposal would be contrary to Policy D3, (part D(1) and part D(11)) and Policy HC1 of The London Plan (2021) which, amongst other things seek to ensure development enhances character, responds to local context and conserves and avoids harm to heritage assets. It would also be contrary to Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (February 2012) and Policy DM1 and DM7 of the Harrow Development Management Policies (July 2013) and the Framework which, amongst other things, seek that development secures a high standard of design, protects and enhances heritage assets and contributes to the character and local distinctiveness of an area. The proposal would also be contrary to guidance in the adopted Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010) which states, with regard to front extensions, that they must reflect and complement the surrounding street scene. The proposal would also be contrary to guidance in the CA Appraisal and Management Strategy which seeks to retain original features and details.

12. I am satisfied that the harm to the CA would be at the lower end of less than substantial harm, and in such instances paragraph 215 of the Framework states that such harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. However, although there would be an undoubted private benefit to the appellant from the proposed development, no public benefits have been presented against which to weigh against the less than substantial harm to the CA.

Other Matters

13. The appellant's wish to provide more storage space, improve security and energy efficiency are understood and the willingness to comply with any drainage requirements is noted, however these considerations do not outweigh the harm identified. I recognise that the proposed development would be acceptable with regard to the amenity of neighbouring properties, although the absence of harm in this regard carries no significant weight.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding.
15. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR