



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: 27 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/25/3368195

Land to the Rear of 77 and 79 Carlyon Avenue, South Harrow, Harrow HA2 8ST

- 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 A Young against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/0193/25.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of detached garage, re-development to provide a detached single storey dwelling with green roof (one x one bed), access off Earlsmead, amenity space, hard and soft landscaping, boundary treatment and bin / cycle storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - whether the proposal is in a suitable location having regard to the Council's spatial strategy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Located within a predominantly residential area, the appeal site accommodates a single storey brick-built garage to the rear of 77 and 79 Carlyon Avenue. It is separated from these properties by a fence and is adjacent to the access to Harrow Borough Football Club. The neighbouring long linear rear gardens of the properties that front Carlyon Avenue feature sheds and outbuildings of varying size and appearance. The gardens and low-lying structures offer an element of spaciousness, contributing positively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The proposal would introduce a single storey one bedroom dwelling that would be finished in a palette of materials to reflect the surrounding properties which would help to assimilate the proposal into the area. However, even though the proposed dwelling would be of a low height that would be similar to other outbuildings, it would be of a substantial size, with a noticeably larger footprint than the existing garage and not consistent with other outbuildings. The proposal would fill the plot almost entirely and would not be well separated from its plot boundaries as advised in the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Residential Design Guide (2010). The proposed scale and massing would detract from the open

character of the area and in doing so would not respond positively to local character, contrary to advice in the SPD Residential Design Guide (2010).

5. The erosion of the characteristic open qualities would be readily apparent in views from Earlsmead from where the appeal scheme would be seen as a visually discordant addition in the street scene. It would also stand out as being an incongruous form of development when viewed from surrounding properties and gardens. Landscaping would not mitigate the harm identified and despite having a green roof to provide visual interest the proposal would also not meet the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that seek well designed places, due to the failure of the scheme to respond to local context.
6. To conclude on this main issue, the proposal would be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would be in conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) (LP), Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012) (CS) and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) (DMPLP). These policies include a requirement for development to optimise site capacity through a design led approach that includes positively responding to the existing character of a place and achieving a high standard of design, resisting proposals that would harm the character of suburban areas.

Location

7. The Council's spatial strategy aims to provide housing without detriment to the Borough's character and the wider environment. CS Policy CS1 directs development to the Harrow and Wealdstone Intensification Area, town centres and strategic previously developed sites. Under this policy, in managing growth, proposals that would harm the character of suburban areas will be resisted, including garden development, as gardens are an integral part of Harrow's suburban character.
8. The appellant contends that because the appeal site accommodates an outbuilding and is said to have a separate title deed it is not garden land. However, the SPD Garden Land Development (2013) explains that any land that formed part of a garden, but which has been legally and/or physically severed from the donor property, falls within the definition of garden land for the purposes of CS Policy CS1. Therefore, even if the appeal site is a legally separate planning unit, in the absence of any substantiated evidence that it did not originally form part of a garden, the appeal site would still fall under the definition of garden land. Furthermore, the proposal meets the definition of garden land development, described in the SPD as any development on garden land that results in the formation of one or more new dwellings. CS Policy CS1 is therefore applicable.
9. As the appeal site is physically separate from the gardens of Nos 77 and 79 by a fence there would be no effect on the size of the rear gardens of these properties. Nevertheless, considering my assessment under the first main issue, the proposal would be detrimental to Harrow's suburban character. Therefore, in conclusion, the proposal would not be in a suitable location having regard to the Council's spatial strategy and would be in conflict with CS Policy CS1 which amongst other things, resists garden land development.

Other Matters

10. The principle of residential development at the site is not in dispute and there is considerable support for boosting the supply of housing. The proposed development would make a positive contribution to the supply of housing in the area on a small windfall site that the Framework recognises are often built out relatively quickly. This is a clear benefit which given the scale of the proposal attracts limited positive weight. There is said to be no significant consequences for surface water and car parking, and access to services and secure by design principles would be satisfactory. However, this, and any other policy compliance would be a neutral factor weighing neither for nor against the proposal. Consequently, the above matters are insufficient to outweigh the harm and conflict with the development plan identified under the main issues.

Conclusion

11. 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