
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2025 by F Bradford BA (Hons)

Decision by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/25/3367824

19, Crown Street, Harrow on the Hill, Harrow, HA2 0HX

- 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 Mrs Emily Fourie against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/0370/25.
 - The development the replacement of the external door and a bin store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. Based on the application form and what I have witnessed on site, the outbuilding has been constructed.
4. I have taken the description of development from the application form submitted to the council. However, in the interests of clarity, I have altered its wording to remove elements that are not in themselves 'development'.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the development's effect on the character and appearance of the area and whether it preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Harrow on the Hill Village Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site is an end-of-terrace, two storey dwelling located on a corner plot between Crown Street and Waldron Road, with its rear boundary wall running along the latter. The Harrow on the Hill Village Management Strategy (management strategy) states the area "forms the historic core of the Hill, scattered with the area's earliest buildings. Its unique townscape comprises a historical settlement of considerable antiquity and visual quality, set along an irregular network of ancient highways, and bounded by open spaces, which serve to accentuate its distinction from the surrounding London sprawl". Crown Street and Waldron Road are characterised by a dense urban layout, with buildings located on the edge of the

footpath/highway which creates a sense of enclosure. Architecturally, two-storey period dwellings dominate the streetscapes with a prevailing material palette of brick.

7. The development has introduced a small timber outbuilding used as a bin store, with associated concrete plinth, sited to the public side of the rear boundary wall along Waldron Road.
8. I acknowledge the development's purpose and its resulting influence on its overall bulk. However, its bulk, combined with the use of timber and concrete, which are at odds with the immediate contextual material palette of Waldron Road, results in an incongruous feature within the streetscape.
9. This effect is worsened by the natural topography of Waldron Road which rises upward from Crown Street. As such, the development is at a higher ground level and is therefore afforded greater prominence when viewed from the latter. The development serves to disrupt the contribution of the established building forms and urban layout of the context of the appeal site, which had contributed to its character and appearance.
10. Whilst it is regrettable that the "hedge" has been partially removed, I do not consider that the harm arising from the development is found on this basis. The management strategy identifies that street greenery is vital to the conservation area as a whole, however within the context of the appeal site, greenery is scarce. As described previously, it is instead the urban layout in terms of density, and sense of enclosure which contribute to the prevailing character and appearance of the streetscape.
11. The development is located within the siting of a non-designated heritage asset, 13 Crown Street (Former North Star Public House) which the local list entry notes retains many of its original features, including sign of which the building derives its architectural interest. Having given due regard, I do not consider that the visual harm to the area and street directly harms the specific and individual significance of the locally listed building at 13 Crown Street.
12. Nevertheless, I consider that the appeal scheme, by virtue of its scale, siting and design, has a negative material impact, that fails to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area and harms the setting of the adjacent locally listed building.
13. Given the modest scale of the development, the harm is less than substantial in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). In this instance, the Framework sets out that harm should be balanced against public benefit. The appellant has noted that the development has reduced the amount of littering that had been experienced. Whilst this may be the case, the development and harm to heritage assets arising from it would be permanent, unlike the temporary effects of litter. For these reasons, I do not consider that the harm identified would be outweighed by public benefits.
14. Therefore, for the reasons above, I find that the development does not act to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area and instead serves to harm the appearance of the streetscape and the setting of the adjacent locally listed building. As such, the development would not meet the statutory tests set out in Section 72 (Conservation Areas) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Further, I find conflict with the Harrow

Local Development plan with particular regard to policies CS1 (Local Character) of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) and DM1 (Character and Amenity), DM6 (Areas of Special Character), and DM7 (Heritage Assets) of the Harrow Development Management policies Local Plan (2013), which, among other things aim to ensure that development responds positively to the local and historic context, achieves a high standard of design including its bulk, scale and materials, and secures the preservation, conservation or enhancement of heritage assets and their settings.

Other Matters

15. I note the appellant's submissions regarding the previous planning permission (P/1595/19) granted on the site, including the relocation of the side boundary wall and the removal of the small landscaped area alongside the property on Waldron Road. However, this relates to a different form of development and should not be taken as an acceptable context for or justification of the appeal scheme.
16. Whilst the council may have identified a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) within the constraints section of the delegated report, this issue is not further contested, nor has it formed part of the council's further assessment and subsequent reasons for refusal. Similarly, the issues of drainage and enforcement complaints have not formed a basis of the council's reasons for refusal of the development. As such, I have afforded these issues extremely limited weight within my recommendation.
17. The red line boundary before me indicates that the development is located on land within ownership of the appellant. However, this would not preclude its harmful effects.
18. The appellant has drawn my attention to numerous waste containers stored on the public highway. Whilst I am unable to assert the location of these containers, nor their permanence in their sitings before me, I nevertheless do not find this to be a comparative basis against the appeal development. Waste containers, such as those shown with wheels, are an unfixed feature and are not permanent within their siting. On the other hand, the appeal development represents a permanent, fixed structure to the streetscape on which harm arises.
19. Whilst the appellant has referenced an intent to add foundation mortar and pointing to the plinth of the development, this is not before me within this appeal to consider.

Conclusion and Recommendation

20. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Finlay Bradford

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

21. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

David Troy INSPECTOR