
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2025 by E Nutman BA (Hons)

Decision by B Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/25/3368157

54 Carlton Avenue, Kenton, HA3 8AY

- 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 Vijay Varsani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/0727/25.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'single-storey rear and part side ground floor extension, first floor rear infill extension placement of two new windows'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Council's reason for refusal relates to the single-storey rear extension only and the accompanying officer report confirms that this is the main area of concern. I have therefore defined the main issue on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue of the appeal is the proposal's effect on the living conditions of 56 Carlton Avenue, with particular regard to overshadowing and loss of outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal dwelling, 54 Carlton Avenue (No 54), is a semi-detached, pseudo-Tudor style property which consists of two storeys. The appeal property shares its boundaries with 52 and 56 Carlton Avenue (No 56). No 56 has a two-storey rear extension with a deep projection, and a single storey extension which sits adjacent the boundary shared with the appeal site, that is approximately 2.3m deep. This single storey extension features French doors and windows that look out towards No 56's rear garden. A closed-board timber fence, runs along the boundary, dividing No 54 and 56 from one another.
6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document, Residential Design Guide (2010) (SPD) provides guidance on rear extensions. This sets out that where planning permission is required, the acceptable depth of extensions will be

determined by the need for consistency with permitted development limitations as well as site considerations, such as the development's impact on the 'amenity of neighbouring residents'. No 56's windows to the rear elevation would sit between the side wall of its two-storey extension and the side wall of the proposed single storey extension at the appeal site, leaving an enclosed, and somewhat narrow, space between the two walls. As a result, the depth of the extension would create a tunnel effect which would inappropriately restrict No. 56's outlook, creating an unacceptable sense of enclosure.

7. As a result, the loss of outlook would be unacceptable due to the combined height and depth of the extension. The sloping section proposed to the end of the flat roof is not considered to appropriately lessen this impact. Consequently, the proposal would unduly restrict the outlook provided by the rear windows seen to No 56's extension. The appellant contends that it is only the 0.7m length to the end, which extends beyond the 'generally accepted 3m depth' that is the key issue. However, as the scheme is seeking full planning permission, it is necessary to assess the impact that would arise from the whole of the extension.
8. The rear elevations of the appeal site and neighbouring property are Northeast facing, predominantly gaining access to sunlight in the mornings. As such, these receive a limited amount of sunlight to windows on their rear elevations due to the orientation of the properties and the natural path of the sun. Therefore, the proposed rear extension would not unacceptably reduce levels of sunlight or daylight due to the existing site conditions of No 56. Nonetheless, this does not overcome the harm I have found in relation to the anticipated loss of outlook.
9. I conclude, the proposal would unacceptably harm the living conditions of No 56 due to a loss of outlook. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021) and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013). These seek, amongst other matters, to ensure that adequate outlook within buildings is delivered and maintained. I have also had regard to the council's SPD (2010). I have afforded limited weight to draft Policy GR1 of the Draft Harrow Local Plan as it is yet to be formally adopted.

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 dismissed.

E Nutman

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 dismissed.

B Plenty

INSPECTOR