



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2025

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/25/3371794

6 The Ridgeway, Harrow HA3 0LL

- 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 Joshi against the decision of Brent Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0942.
 - The development proposed is for a part ground floor side extension and ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by the appellant against the Council and is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matter

3. Whilst not explicitly referred to within the description of the proposed development found within the submitted planning application forms, the council's sole concern is with regard to the scale of the front porch on the principal elevation of the host dwelling. I was able to view this part of the appeal site from the public highway and consequently carried out an unaccompanied site visit. I determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed porch upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a bay fronted link-detached house with a hipped roof porch canopy over the front door. There are many examples of replacement porches within the street, some of which project forward of their respective bay window. It is not for me to comment on the appropriateness of these or otherwise however, but ultimately each case must be assessed on its own merits.
6. In this particular case, the proposal is for a gable fronted enclosed porch that would project forward of the bay window on the host dwelling, in lieu of the existing subservient feature which appears to be original in its construction.

7. In purely two dimensional form, the proposed porch would appear largely proportionate to the principal elevation of no 6, however in three dimensional reality it would be viewed differently by virtue of the overall depth and consequent forward projection.
8. I accept that the building frontages along The Ridgeway are not uniform and whilst it may not interrupt a continuous building line and remain visually recessive relative to the more forward sited no 4, I consider that the proposal would detract from the overall character and appearance of the host dwelling itself.
9. I acknowledge that a 3m² porch could quite possibly be constructed under permitted development rights, however that is not the proposal before me. I note that the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (January 2023) stipulates that with respect to porches they should not extend forward of any existing projecting features e.g. beyond a bay window, unless it is a common feature of an area's character. Whilst I acknowledge that there are some examples where porches project beyond bay windows I consider that these are not a common feature and to allow so further would erode the overall character and appearance of the area.
10. I therefore find that the front porch would detract from the visual amenities of the host dwelling and in addition to conflicting with the advice set out within the SPD, also conflicts with policy DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan 2019 – 2041 which stipulates that development will be acceptable provided it is of a design and scale that compliments the locality.

Conclusion

11. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR