



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2025

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/25/3361718

131 Regal Way, Harrow, Brent, HA3 0SG

- 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 Harshal Kumar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref is 24/3433.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and extension and creation of a new single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing garage and extension and creation of a new single-storey rear extension at 131 Regal Way, Harrow, Brent, HA3 0SG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/3433, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Site Location Plan at scale 1:1250 and drawings entitled Page 1.1 of 5 Rev 1, Page 1 of 5 Rev 1 and Page 2 of 5 Rev 1.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling within a residential suburb comprising similar properties. It has an existing single-storey extension across its full width with a splayed side facing wall where its rear corner meets the front corner of a detached garage which is built along the shared common side boundary with the unattached neighbouring property at No 129. There is a small, flat roof plant room which projects further from the back of the garage and which is set away from the plot's side boundary. The proposal would replace the existing extension and garage with a 7.1m deep extension across the full width of the

dwelling, equivalent in depth to the existing garage. The plant room would be retained as an adjunct to the extension.

4. The Council's *Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD), adopted in January 2025, deals with single-storey rear extensions at section 3.1. It advises that for terraced or semi-detached homes, single-storey rear extensions could be up to 6m in depth from the original rear wall of the property. It further advises that such extensions more than 3m deep for an attached home could also be up to 4 metres in height as long as they have an eaves height of no more than 2.5m along the boundary to any neighbouring properties. The extension would have a flat roof, with only a very gentle slope, measuring around 3m high along the boundary with the attached property at No 133.
5. No 133 has been extended across its full width to the rear with an approximate 6m deep, single-storey addition. I observed that this has a height similar to that proposed at No 131. Although the proposal would project beyond the next-door property's extension, it would follow the depth of the existing garage, with the added benefit to this side of built development being pulled away from the boundary with No 129, which itself has been extended to the rear. The plant room would add extra depth but it would reflect the existing arrangement of built form on the site in terms of its position, size and height.
6. The Council accepts that there would be no impact upon the living conditions of either adjoining occupiers. I have no reason to disagree. It is clear that deep extensions do exist to properties in the immediate area. The proposal would be undeniably deeper than those immediately adjoining and due to its depth and height along the boundary with No 133, it would conflict with the SPD guidelines. However, having regard to the existing arrangement of buildings on the site and those adjacent, I am unable to identify how the extension would appear harmful within the containment of its rear garden setting. Its visual impact would either reflect the existing form of the garage and plant room when seen from one side beyond the rear extension at No 129, or else would be largely masked by the size, depth and proximity of the extension on the other side at No 133. In the absence of any harm, I am unable to find conflict with Policy DMP1 of the Brent Local Plan 2019-2041, adopted in 2022, as far as it requires development to complement the locality.

Conditions

7. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is needed for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area, a condition is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in materials to match the existing.

Conclusion

8. Having regard to the specific circumstances in this case, I conclude that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of No 131 or the wider area. Accordingly, the appeal succeeds.

John D Allan INSPECTOR