
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2025

by **F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/25/3367133

30C Roxborough Park, Harrow HA1 3AY

- 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 Mukunda Sharma against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/0198/25.
 - The development is retrospective application for the existing front boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. During my site visit, I observed a development which appeared the same as that shown on the application plans. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis that planning permission is sought to retain the development that has been constructed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, bearing in mind that it is within the Roxborough Park and The Grove Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on Roxborough Park, a residential street where properties are primarily set back from the road by gardens, which creates a verdant character. Boundary treatments vary in height and design, however the generally low height and predominant use of soft landscaping results in an overall conformity and a largely harmonious character and appearance.
5. It falls within the CA and in line with section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. From my observations and the CA Study (2008), the significance of the CA, insofar as is relevant to this case, is primarily derived from the green and leafy front gardens that soften the streetscape and provide a soft and informal feel, creating an attractive setting for the architecture of the area. The appeal site's vegetated front garden, including established trees, displays some of the characteristic qualities of the conservation area and generally contributes positively to the CA.

6. The development at the appeal site comprises the construction of a red brick wall and timber trellis erected on top of an existing white rendered wall. Combined, the boundary treatment is noticeably taller than the prevailing low-lying walls and hedges and along with the use of hard landscaping materials, conveys a sense of severance and defensiveness in the streetscape. Moreover, in the area immediate to the site I saw no examples of boundary treatments of a similar height or appearance to the appeal development. Consequently, the development is contrary to the guidance in the Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guide (2010) (the SPD), which advises that boundary materials should reflect those prevailing in the surrounding area.
7. The SPD also encourages the use of hedges and other green boundaries. Despite the trellis offering some filtered views of the front garden, the use of hard landscaping and its generally solid appearance draws the eye and is uncharacteristic of the area. The trellis is said to allow climbing plants however I did not observe any foliage covering the trellis and so the whole extent of the timber trellis is visible from the street. Even if the appeal development was painted white to match the pre-existing wall this would not integrate the development into its verdant setting.
8. The appeal property's palette of materials includes the use of red brick as a design feature including around the windows, and so the continuous solid wall of red brick of the appeal scheme offers limited visual continuity. While there are other brick boundary treatments nearby, they are generally low level, whereas the appeal development's height draws the eye, exacerbating its visual intrusion. Therefore, the development is seen as a discordant addition within the surrounding verdant character. Viewed in this context the development appears out of place, detracting from the streetscape along this section of Roxborough Park and results in a small, but nevertheless, detrimental, erosion of the historic environment.
9. While it is suggested that the timber trellis could be removed, lowered or additional climbing vegetation planted to mitigate the effects of the development I do not have any plans showing this and it would not be appropriate to comment on a scheme I have not seen. There is also support for the appeal development from local residents, however this is not a reason in itself to allow inappropriate development. The Council's handling of the application has not affected my consideration of the planning merits of the case.
10. The appellant has drawn my attention to another appeal¹ where permission was granted for amongst other things brick walls and iron railing boundary treatment. However, the other appeal is on a different section of Roxborough Park, and as such its context differs in overall appearance and relationship with the street scene. Furthermore, the other scheme and appeal property is different in design and appearance to the development before me and so is not directly comparable. In any event, I have considered this appeal scheme on its own planning merits.
11. Overall, the development does not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA and harms its significance as a whole. The appeal development does not therefore meet the requirements of the Act or the provisions in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) regarding the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. Bearing in mind the

¹ APP/M5450/D/23/3322738

scale and nature of the development relative to the designated heritage asset, the degree of harm would be less than substantial, and towards the lower end of the spectrum. In these circumstances, the Framework states that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits. I will return to this matter later.

12. To conclude, the development harms the character and appearance of the area, failing to preserve the CA and harming its significance. It conflicts with Policies HC1 and D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and Policies DM1 and DM7 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013). Amongst other things, these policies require development to enhance local context, responding to the existing character of a place and the historic context having regard to design and appearance, including scale, height and materials. Development is also required to conserve the significance of heritage assets, including through actively managing cumulative incremental change.

Heritage Balance

13. The harm to the significance of the CA would be less than substantial harm. The Framework requires that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets, irrespective of the level of harm. Any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should also require a clear and convincing justification. Nevertheless, the Framework also requires such harm to be weighed against any public benefits.
14. The appellant indicates that they tried using soft landscaping as a boundary treatment through the planting of photinia bushes which is said to have made little difference to anti-social behaviour, whereas the development has secured the safety and privacy of the occupiers of the appeal property. It has also prevented previous anti-social behaviour within the street which is a wider social benefit for the living conditions of other nearby residents. However, there is no substantiated evidence to show that the appeal development is the only option to deter crime and antisocial behaviour at the site. Consequently, any crime prevention arising from the appeal scheme as a social benefit attracts limited positive weight.
15. Taking the above into consideration, the public benefits of the development do not outweigh the harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset that I have identified.

Conclusion

16. My above findings bring the proposal into conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR