



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/25/3372813

232 Whitchurch Lane, Harrow, Edgware HA8 6QH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by C Rance against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/1888/25.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension: 6.00 metres deep, 3.20 metres maximum height and 3.00 metres high to the eaves.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development above is taken from the decision notice as this accurately reflects the proposal. Both parties have used this in their submissions, so I am satisfied that no one is prejudiced by this approach.

Background and Main Issue

3. Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO) permits the enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwellinghouse, subject to limitations and conditions. The Council contend that the proposal would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation and would exceed the limitations set out in Paragraph A.1(j) and so would not be permitted development.
4. Consequently, the main issue is whether the proposal would be permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO, with regard to whether the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse.

Reasons

5. The appeal property has a two-storey projection on the rear elevation, resulting in a stepped profile which means there is more than one rear wall. It has the same pebble dash finish as the rest of the appeal property, and I have no clear reason to find otherwise that the projection forms part of the original dwellinghouse.
6. The Permitted Development Rights for Householders Technical Guidance (2019) (the Technical Guidance) advises that a wall forming a side elevation of a house will be any wall that cannot be identified as being a front wall or a rear wall.

Whether a wall is a side elevation is a question of fact and degree, applied to the words of the GPDO, rather than judgment. Moreover, the Technical Guidance makes it clear that even very small side elevations can constitute a side wall and contains diagrams to illustrate this.

7. Although the projection at the rear of the appeal property is small, the short wall of the recess would constitute a wall forming a side elevation for the purposes of the GPDO. The proposal would therefore extend beyond a side elevation and GPDO Paragraph A.1 (j) is relevant. It states that development is not permitted by Class A if the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse and would (i) exceed 4 metres in height, (ii) have more than a single storey, or (iii) have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse.
8. Failure to meet any of the limitations in A.1(j)(i) to (iii) would take the proposal out of permitted development. There is no doubt that the proposal would have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse, being the full width of the house itself.
9. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse and would be more than half the width of the original dwellinghouse. The proposal would therefore not constitute permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR