
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2025

by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/25/3369555

9 Summit Close, Harrow, Edgware HA8 6EJ

- 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 and Mrs Pancholi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application ref is PL/0367/25.
 - The development proposed is described as: dropped kerb to form access to driveway including the hard standing to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal submission includes updated drawings which identify the neighbouring tree, which was not previously included on the submitted drawings, and reduces the area of the proposed permeable block paving surface. Paragraph 16.1 of the Procedural Guide: Planning appeals – England (June 2025) is clear that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and there are no provisions within the rules for amendments to be submitted. It is important that what is considered by the Inspector at appeal is essentially the same scheme that was considered by the Local Planning Authority and by interested parties at the application stage.
3. Where amendments are proposed, regard should be had to the principles established in *Holborn Studios Ltd*, including whether the amendments would materially alter the nature of the application and whether anyone who should have been consulted on the changed development would be deprived of that opportunity. The proposal would reduce the size of the proposed permeable block paving surface and thus the area available for car parking. Accepting the revisions could deprive those who were entitled to be consulted of the opportunity to make any representations as part of an appeal. For this reason, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the plans that were before the Council when it made its decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site forms a semi-detached property set back from the highway by a large section of grass. This part of Summit Close is characterised by dwellings set back generously from the public realm, primarily by grassed areas. When combined with a number of hedgerows and mature trees within these front gardens, the street possesses a spacious and green character.
6. The grassed area to the front of the appeal property contributes to the green nature of this part of the highway. A substantial tree adjoins the appeal site boundary. The tree's proximity to the highway gives it a prominent presence within the street scene, making a positive contribution to the green character and appearance of the area.
7. The proposal would result in the grassed area being replaced by a large area of permeable block paving. The absence of any soft landscaping features would appear out of character with the surrounding grass frontages and detract from the existing green character of the area. The proposed paving would adjoin the boundary with the mature tree and no information is before me demonstrating how the proposed works would affect it. The appellant contends that the proposal would not remove the existing tree. However, I cannot be sure that the proposed works would not have a detrimental effect on its health and therefore its contribution to the greenery of the area. As such, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area.
8. As such, I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies DM1, DM22 and DM23 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies (2013) and Policies D3 and G7 of the London Plan. When read together these policies require development to retain or enhance existing landscaping and trees, for hard and soft landscaping to be appropriate to the character of the area, and to respect the character of the area.

Other Matters

9. The appellant raises the council's request for an extension of time and a perceived lack of communication. Whilst I sympathise with the appellant, this is a procedural matter and not something I can consider as part of the appeal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

N Unwin

INSPECTOR