



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2026 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/C/24/3355641

Land at 180 Marsh Lane, Stanmore, Harrow HA7 2SL

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Shiraz Andani- Dharamshi against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The notice was issued on 24 October 2024.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is “without planning permission, the unauthorised installation of 1.85m high front boundary wall with brick piers and electric sliding gate”.
 - The requirements of the notice are to:
 1. Demolish the unauthorised development or reduce its height to no more than 1 metre above the natural ground level.
 2. Remove from the land all materials and debris arising from compliance with the aforementioned requirement of the notice.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements of the notice is three months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the ground set out in section 174(2)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed, the enforcement notice is upheld, and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under s177(5) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Appeal Procedure and Preliminary Matter

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. In addition, and prior to the making of this recommendation, a revised National Planning Policy Framework was published. Having reviewed the changes, I am satisfied that they do not affect the substantive matters of the appeal and that proceeding without further consultation with the main parties would not be prejudicial to their respective cases.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached bungalow set back from and facing the road. The street scene is characterised by similar buildings with deep front gardens leading onto wide grass verges towards the carriageway which reinforce the pleasant open character of the immediate area. This is emphasised by generally low boundary treatments which are squat and demarcate the edge of the property

boundary rather than shield it. These features in combination contribute positively to the spacious qualities of the area.

5. The principle of boundary treatments is acceptable given the surrounding context; however, the height and the solidity of the scheme obscure the front elevation of the bungalow. Whilst the building is not so in its entirety, the key forward facing features are shielded by the wall and timber boarding, which resultantly detracts from the prevailing open views to the wider bungalows along this side of the street. There is a variation in the type of boundary treatment, but they are consistent in their modest height and positioning, whereby, the appeal scheme is alien and intrusive, unacceptably interrupting the spacious feel of the street scene. The material choice is different; however, they do sit comfortably with the design of the dwelling and in the context of the variation along the street, they do not appear incongruous.
6. The walling was erected at this height as a precautionary measure for security due to a previous burglary and car theft. I appreciate the appellant's attempts at security proofing their property, however I remain to be convinced that this is the sole way to achieve that outcome given other measures such as steering locks, wheel clamps and CCTV have not been discounted as being suitable. I could therefore give no more than limited weight to this matter in light of the harm I have found.
7. Overall, and notwithstanding the lack of harm in terms of the material choice, the height and location of the scheme causes harm to the character and appearance of the area. It thus conflicts with Policy D3 D (1) and (11) of the London Plan 2021, Core Policy CS1B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, Policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan 2013, the adopted Harrow Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide 2010 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2024. Amongst other things these seek to ensure high-quality contextually appropriate design.

Other Matter

8. I understand that the appellant has raised concerns with the Council's handling of previous planning applications prior to the enforcement notice being issued. However, it does not appear that they appealed any of these decisions. Moreover, this is a matter for the main parties to deal with outside of the appeal process.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above, the development does not comply with the development plan, and I have been given no other compelling reason, taking into account other material considerations advanced, to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal on ground (a) should fail and the deemed application for planning permission should be refused.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed. The effect of this is that the enforcement notice

is upheld, and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under s177(5) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

John Morrison

INSPECTOR