



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2025

by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/25/3368209

30 Kenton Park Parade, Kenton Road, Kenton, Harrow HA3 8DN

- 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 Lakhani of VBL ENTERPRISE LTD against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/0870/25.
 - The development proposed is the installation of retractable canopy with timber flower bed to front elevation, installation of bi-folding doors on side and front part of new canopy at ground floor level front forecourt to be used for siting of removable tables and removable chairs between the times 09:00 to 21:00.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. The appellant indicates they are seeking retrospective permission however I did not observe any development as described above. As such, I have determined this appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a mid-terrace property within a parade of commercial premises which at ground floor level have deep forecourts that meet a relatively wide footpath. The area has a mixed-use character with a varied appearance where canopies of varying designs are a feature. Despite the differences in appearance, the similarity in the general scale of the built form creates a sense of balance that contributes positively to the area
5. The proposal is said to replace an outdated and visually tired fabric canopy with a modern canopy supported by an aluminium frame with retractable bi-folding doors with glazed panels attached to the front and side of the frame. It would be set back from the footpath, and the canopy and doors would be retractable. However, the permanent aluminium frame would be a dominant protrusion that would neither reinforce the existing character and appearance of the area or relate positively to the local environment and would not achieve a well-designed place as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

6. Some of the canopies nearby have permanent elements, including low level and small-scale timber planters and screens. In comparison, the proposal's permanent aluminium frame would be of a considerable height, drawing the eye. Despite the relatively slimline frame and the use of glazing, the frame's height and the added bulk of the bi-folding doors would result in an uncharacteristic, cluttered appearance that would unbalance the prevailing character and appearance of the area. While canopies and outdoor seating areas are a feature of the area I did not observe any of the same design as the scheme before me, including the appeal scheme at 36-37 Kenton Park Parade¹ which was found to be an acceptable height and does not include an aluminium frame. As such, the visual intrusion of the proposal would be readily apparent in views along Kenton Park Parade and to the occupiers of the dwellings on the opposite side of the road.
7. There are several other examples of canopies elsewhere in the Borough, some of which have a similar design to the appeal scheme. However, the context of these examples differs in both overall appearance, scale and relationship with the street scene. Any comparison with other examples, does not therefore, indicate that the form of this proposal would sit comfortably within its setting. In any event, I have come to my own view.
8. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would be in conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013). These policies include a requirement for development to optimise site capacity through a design led approach that includes positively responding to the existing character of a place and achieving a high standard of design.
9. On the decision notice, the Council also refer to the Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guide (2010). However, as this relates to residential development it is not determinative in this appeal.

Other Matters

10. The purpose and design of the proposal would offer customers with protection from the elements during inclement weather which would lead to clear benefits to this particular business, allowing year-round use of the seating area and supporting economic growth in line with Framework paragraph 85. However, it has not been shown that the appeal scheme is the only way to meet the appellants aims and the precise extent of benefit has not been clearly articulated. This benefit therefore attracts limited weight and is insufficient to outweigh the harm and conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

11. 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

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/23/3333697