



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2024 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/24/3345042

215 Long Elmes, Harrow Weald, Harrow, Middlesex, HA3 6LE

- 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 Fazel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/0169/24.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 215 Long Elmes, Harrow, HA3 6LE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/0169/24, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: A3/09843-01, A3/09843-02, A3/09843-03, A3/09843-06, A3/09843-07 and A3/09843-08.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the living conditions of the occupants of 213 Long Elmes, with regards to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling on Long Elmes. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature and characterised by semi-detached properties with long rear gardens. The generous plot sizes provide a spaciousness that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The appeal dwelling is enclosed by a tall fence which separates the property with No.213 and appears to be approximately 3 metres in height. The host

property benefits from an extant planning permission for a 3 metre deep single storey extension to the rear, which is stepped off the boundary with No.213 by 1.7 metres.

6. The proposed rear extension would be closer to the boundary than the previously approved scheme, but would remain single storey and be relatively low in height. It would also comprise an overall limited depth particularly when considering the overall length of the garden.
7. Whilst the extension would be visible from No.213, its low height and flat roof design ensures that the proposed development would not represent a visually overbearing feature for the existing occupiers of No.213. This would particularly be the case when taking into account the previously approved scheme which, whilst stepped away from the boundary, resulted in a 3-metre deep extension to the rear. In addition the tall fence that currently exists along the boundary would help screen a large proportion of the extension ensuring that the neighbouring outlook would not be unacceptably impacted from No.213. The orientation of No.213 and the positioning of the windows within the rear elevation would also mean that it would continue to enjoy principally direct outlook over the length of its rear garden. The proposed extension would therefore as a result neither be overbearing nor visually obtrusive to the occupiers of No.213.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the living conditions of the existing occupiers of 213 Long Elmes, with particular regard to outlook. It would therefore accord with Policy D3 D (7) of the London Plan (2021) and Policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies Local Plan document (2013) which together, amongst other matters, explain that all development proposals will be required to take account of the effect upon the surrounding environment and amenities of occupiers of nearby properties to ensure that these will be minimal both during and after completion. For the same reasons, the proposed development would also accord with the SPD and the aspirations of the Framework relating to achieving well-designed and beautiful places.

Conditions

9. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in light of the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. I agree that time limit and plans conditions are necessary and reasonable in the interests of good planning and to provide certainty. I have also attached a matching materials condition which is necessary and reasonable in the interests of character and appearance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR