



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/M5450/D/25/3371804

Shandon, Poplar Close, Pinner, Harrow HA5 3PZ

- 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 A Kumar against the decision of the London Borough of Harrow Council.
 - The application Ref. is PL/2268/24.
 - The development proposed is for a detached outbuilding at front for use as office/gym, canopy for car parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a detached outbuilding at front for use as office/gym, canopy for car parking at Shandon, Poplar Close, Pinner, Harrow HA5 3PZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. PL/2268/24 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the host building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: APL-DR-00-00, APL-DR-P3-00-22 and APL-DR-P3-00-23; and the Arboricultural Implications Assessment and Method Statement dated August 2025.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon trees and consequently the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached bungalow set to the north east of the Poplar Close cul-de-sac and surrounded by residential properties on all sides.
4. The site's north eastern and north western boundaries are contiguous with that of the Pinner Wood Park Estate conservation area and the gardens of properties fronting Woodhall Gate and Old South Close respectively.

5. As set out within the Arboricultural Implications Assessment and Method Statement (AIA) there are a number of trees found both within the appeal site and within adjacent gardens. All of those found within the appeal site itself are deemed category C trees to which I concur. The submitted tree protection plan identifies that aside from a group of trees, G1, which comprises a coppiced Hazel, Lilac, Cherry, Laurel and Apple trees, no others would be materially affected by the proposal. Further, as G1 falls outside of the conservation area there are no controls over its removal which I consider is not worthy of preservation in its own right. The tree of most significance within the immediate locality is that identified as T8 which is a category A common Oak tree which falls within the rear garden of one of the Woodhall Gate properties, the root protection area of which would be well beyond any areas of excavation required to construct the outbuilding.
6. Therefore, I am satisfied that the health of surrounding protected trees would not be at risk during either construction or occupation of the outbuilding or from associated landscaping works, consequently I consider that the character and appearance of the area would be maintained by the proposal. I therefore find that the proposal complies with policies D3 and G7 of The London Plan (2023) and policy DM22 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies (July 2013) which together require proposals to provide spaces and buildings that maximise opportunities for urban greening, to create attractive resilient places that can also help the management of surface water, through amongst other things, protecting London's urban forest and require trees identified for retention to be protected during construction.

Other Matters

7. I note the third party concerns with regard to overdevelopment, privacy and visual impact, flood risk and drainage, access and red line boundary issues, permitted development restrictions, vehicular access and parking, environmental and wildlife impacts, along with tree safety, future use and precedent, the accuracy of the application and fire safety and emergency access. The Council's officer report provides a response on all of these matters to which I've been given no substantive reason to come to a different conclusion and consequently they are not determining factors in this appeal.

Conclusion and Conditions

8. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
9. In addition to the standard time limit condition, the Council has suggested that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans; and that the materials used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted match those used on the existing bungalow. I consider that these are necessary in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR