



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2025

by **F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/25/3369284

2 The Meadow Way, Harrow Weald, Harrow, HA3 7BW

- 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 S Nurmohammad against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/0544/25.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of single-family dwelling into two self-contained units.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I observed that some elements of the proposal have been undertaken, which appear to broadly accord with what is shown on the plans. However, as the development at the site is not in its finished state, for clarity, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether or not the living conditions of the future occupiers of the proposed development would be acceptable, with regard to internal space.

Reasons

4. The proposal would result in the conversion of the appeal property into a ground floor flat and an upper floor flat. The Council has concerns regarding the internal space of the upper floor flat when assessed against the relevant space standards within Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) (LP) for a three-bedroom four person flat. The London Plan Guidance Housing Design Standards (2025) explains that these are an absolute minimum, not a target, and encourages homes to exceed these standards to improve residential quality.
5. Irrespective of the precise amount of floorspace, overall, the proposed accommodation in the upper floor flat would be generally limited in size, leading to a cramped and claustrophobic environment. In coming to this view, I have taken account of the proposed number of occupiers and that one of the single bedrooms and the second-floor double room have sloping roofs which limits the amount of usable floor area. It has also not been shown that the required amount of built-in storage space could be accommodated. Furthermore, the two single bedrooms on the first floor are modest in size, and there are no detailed floorplans showing internal arrangements to indicate that there is sufficient space in each bedroom for

suitably sized and arranged furniture to ensure that these spaces would be comfortable and inviting for occupiers to use.

6. It is not therefore clear that the proposal would achieve a configuration that would be practical and fit for purpose, having regard to storage space and room size and shape, as required by Policy DM26 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) (DMPLP). As a result, the proposal would not meet the guidance in the Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guide (2010) regarding successful living spaces or the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework that seek well designed places.
7. The Appellant indicates that there is an additional plan demonstrating that the upper floor flat would be policy compliant. However, no such plan is before me, and it would not be appropriate to comment on a scheme I have not seen. The planning appeals procedural guide is clear that it is the appellant's responsibility to ensure that at the time of the appeal their case is fully made, including all the documents referred to in their statement¹. Consequently, in the absence of any compelling evidence to the contrary, the accommodation in the upper floor flat would be poor, indicative of the confined nature of the proposal.
8. For the reasons given, I conclude that the living conditions of the future occupiers of the proposed development would not be acceptable, with regard to internal space. It would be in conflict with LP Policies D3 and D6 and DMPLP Policies DM1 and DM26. Amongst other things, these policies require development to achieve a high standard of design to determine the most appropriate form of development, which provides a satisfactory standard of accommodation, complying with the LP minimum space standards.

Conclusion

9. My above findings bring the proposal into conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR

¹ Section 12.2 of the Procedural Guide: Planning appeals – England (2025)