



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2025

by **K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/25/3371452

7 Uppingham Avenue, Stanmore, Harrow HA7 2JH

- 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 Manji Hirani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/2945/24.
 - The development proposed is Conversion of dwelling into two flats (1 x studio & 1 x 2 bed); installation of window in front elevation at ground floor level; parking; separate amenity space; boundary treatment; hard and soft landscaping; bin/cycle storage (Amended Description).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council is in the process towards adopting a new local plan to replace the Harrow Core Strategy 2012 (the CS) and the Harrow Development Management Policies 2013 (the DMP). I am uncertain whether the policies of the emerging local plan are subject to outstanding objections or whether they might change before formal adoption. Consequently, I attach only limited weight to the emerging policies in my assessment.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would provide an adequate standard of accommodation for future occupiers, with particular regard to internal living space for Unit 1.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached property. The application sought permission to subdivide it into two homes. Unit 1 is a single storey one-bedroom unit, whereas Unit 2 occupies the ground floor and space within the roof. The Council has not raised any concerns regarding Unit 2 and my decision is therefore focussed on Unit 1.
5. Policy D6 of the London Plan, 2021 (the London Plan) requires new dwellings to provide adequately sized rooms, which meet the minimum standards specified in *Table 3.1*. Unit 1 exceeds the minimum floor area of 39m² to 37m² for a one-person unit. However, it has not been disputed that Unit 1 falls short of the internal living space requirement set out in *Standard C2.5* of the Housing Design Standards London Plan Guidance 2023 (the HDS LPG). For a one-person unit this requires the combined living/kitchen and dining space to meet or exceed 21m². It

is specified that this should not include the space immediately inside the front door, or any circulation space needed to access other rooms.

6. However, there is a dispute between the parties regarding the intended level of occupancy. The appellant asserts that the unit has been designed for single occupancy, this was set out in the description or plans but briefly outlined in the planning statement. However the Council considers Unit 1 could facilitate occupancy for two-persons. In this case the proposal would be below the London Plan space standards of 50m² specified for a one-bedroom two-person dwelling, and also the below the 23m² *Standard C2.5* for combined living space within the HDS LPG.
7. The bedroom in Unit 1 would be capable of accommodating a double bed along the party wall with Unit 2. It would leave sufficient space around it for circulation, and a small entranceway separating it from the shower room and living and cooking area. This would afford a degree of enclosure for the bedroom. The overall room size also appears to reflect the room width and area of a double or twin bedroom given in London Plan Policy D6 as a built in wardrobe counts towards the gross GIA of a bedroom floor area.
8. Notwithstanding the single bed shown on the floor plans given the large size of the bedroom, the external space to the front and rear with parking and cycle storage, the unit could readily be construed as being suitable for two persons. In this case it would be undersized for two people. It would be difficult to control the occupancy, and it is likely that the unit could be occupied by more than one person, at least for some of the time. Therefore, I must consider the proposal on the possible occupancy in order to consider the potential effects.
9. Although designed with a rational, convenient layout with a garden, the unit would nonetheless fall well below the minimum internal space standards for a double occupancy one-bedroom dwelling. Over 10m² would be a significant shortfall. This would be more likely to be felt within the combined living/kitchen and dining area which would likely feel cramped and impractical to use. This would not create high quality accommodation for two people which the development plan seeks to achieve.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not provide an adequate standard of accommodation for future occupiers, with particular regard to internal living space for Unit 1. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy CS1.K of the Harrow CS and Policies DM26 and DM27 of the Harrow DMP. The proposal is also contrary to London Plan Policy D6. Together and insofar as they are relevant to the main issue, these require, a high standard of residential design and layout consistent with minimum space standards and appropriate amenity space. For similar reasons, the proposal would not comply with the requirements within the HDS LPG.
11. As a result there would be conflict with Paragraph 135 f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) which seeks to create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Matters

12. The Council considers that the proposed development is acceptable in principle, and in respect of outdoor space, bin and cycle storage and parking. However, compliance with planning policy is not a benefit of the proposals and therefore carries neutral weight in my determination. The Framework encourages the effective and efficient use of land in meeting the need for homes and the development of under-utilised land and buildings. However, although the site is in an accessible location, it is already in use as a home and with a net gain of one unit, the contribution to the housing supply in the borough and the associated social and economic benefits would be minimal. As such the harm derived from the proposal outweighs the benefits.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations including the policies of the Framework, that indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

K Williams

INSPECTOR