



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2025

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/25/3369806

12 The Avenue, Harrow Weald, Harrow, HA3 7DF

- 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 Tarquin and Lynne Williams against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/1206/25.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey side-to-rear extension with attached garage; alterations and extension to roof to form end gable; rear dormer; two rooflights in front roof slope; window in end gable; external alterations (demolition of attached garage).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed single-storey side-to-rear extension upon the living conditions at 10 and 14 The Avenue, with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling in a residential neighbourhood comprising similar style and aged properties. The proposal comprises a number of parts. The Council has raised no concerns with the proposed hip-to-gable change, the rear dormer window, or the insertion of rooflights to the front elevation. I have no reasons to disagree.
4. The proposed single-storey element would replace an attached garage to the side, and which extends up to the side common boundary with No 14, with a side-to-rear wrap-around extension to a maximum depth of 6m beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling, and with a dual pitched roof. The rear element would be set away from the side boundary with the attached property at No 10 by around 0.4m, and away from the opposing side boundary with No 14 by approximately 0.9m.
5. I observed during my visit that the attached property at No 10 is a mirror image of No 12 and is unextended to the rear, with a set of glazed double doors nearest to the appeal site leading to a small patio area, and with a long garden extending beyond. The boundary between both is marked by an approximate 1.8m high concrete panel fence extending along the depth of the patio, and with a similar height mesh fence beyond.

6. Although the rear extension has been designed with a low eaves' height of 2.5m, its pitched roof form, with a ridge rising to just over the cill height of the dwelling's first-floor windows, would add considerable scale and bulk to its side profile. Although not hard up against the boundary with No 10, this would be clearly seen above the existing fence and would impose itself in the outlook from within the neighbour's adjoining living space, and from the immediately adjoining rear garden area, at close quarters and for a considerable depth. Contrary to the appellants' assertions, I find that through a combination of its overall height and depth, its presence would be both visually dominant and overbearing, atypical of what residents may reasonably expect to see positioned so close within their rear garden suburban setting. This would adversely affect the living conditions within the neighbours' property and enjoyment of their outdoor amenity space.
7. To the opposite side, I observed No 14 to have an infill extension to the rear of the original garage, and a conservatory addition nearest to its attached neighbour at No 16. Given the separation distances involved to this side, together with the handed layout of No 14 in comparison to the appeal property, with its primary outlook at ground floor set away from the common shared boundary and nearest to No 16, I am not persuaded that the overall size and depth of the proposed rear extension would be overly close or imposing. Its impact would not be significant or harmful to the living conditions of these neighbouring occupiers.
8. Having regard to the *Harrow Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document*, adopted in 2010 (SPD), the proposal would fail its 'two-for-one' rule, which advises that for single-storey extensions deeper than those allowed under permitted development, 3m in this case without prior approval, any additional depth should be set away from any side boundaries of the property by twice the amount of additional depth. There are no special circumstances to the context of No 12 or its relationship with its attached neighbour that suggest the site conditions mean the Council's normal guidelines should simply be set aside without reason.
9. Overall, notwithstanding my findings as they relate to the impact upon the living conditions at No 14, the harm that I have identified to those at No 10 in terms of its visual impact is significant. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021), Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), and Policy DM1 of the Council's Development Management Policies (2013), as well as the aims of the SPD. Between them, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure that new development achieves a high standard of design that responds positively to local distinctiveness and does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of existing and neighbouring occupiers. For these same reasons, there would be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed places, including a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.
10. The appellants have drawn my attention to four specific appeal decisions within the London Borough of Harrow¹. In each case, the appeal was made against a refusal to grant prior approval required under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A.1(g) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015. Whilst I have

¹ APP/M5450/D/21/3282326, APP/M5450/D/21/3282921, APP/M5450/D/19/3238969 and APP/M5450/D/17/3169191

been provided with a copy of the appeal decisions, and in one case a copy of the existing and proposed roof plans, I have no further details of the individual proposals. I am therefore unable to conclude that the circumstances in each case in terms of the size, form, and proximity of the extensions, or the relationships between the neighbouring properties, are directly comparable to those of the proposal that is before me. Moreover, the conclusions reached in the cases that have been put to me do not reflect my own, having considered the appeal on its individual merits.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and notwithstanding the absence of any objections, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR