



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2025

by K Lancaster BA (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/25/3374384

54 Glebe Crescent, Kenton, Harrow HA3 9LD

- 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 Babar Rashid against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/1782/25.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on flood risk, with particular regard to surface water flood risk.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a ground floor flat, within a two-storey building. The proposed development comprises a single storey extension to the rear of the property. It would extend approximately 3 metres from the rear wall, with a width of approximately 9 metres.
4. The appeal site is located within Flood Zone 1, representing the lowest risk of flooding from rivers and the sea. However, it is within Surface Water Flood Zone 3b (High) and 3a (Medium), which is categorised as a high-risk location for surface water flooding.
5. Policy DM9 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan, dated July 2013 (DMP) states that proposals requiring a flood risk assessment must demonstrate that the development will be resistant and resilient to all relevant sources of flooding including surface water. It further states that proposals that would fail to make appropriate provision for flood risk mitigation, or which would increase the risk or consequences of flooding, will be refused.
6. Paragraph 4.5 of the supporting text to Policy DM9 of the DMP states that rainwater falling onto impermeable surfaces such as buildings and hard surfaces has traditionally been disposed of via Harrow's surface water drainage network. However, with the incremental urbanisation of the Borough and finite drainage network capacity there has said to have been increasing incidence of surface water flooding in recent years. It adds that Harrow's Surface Water Management Plan (2012) identifies 15 critical drainage areas susceptible to flooding from

surface water and other sources. These critical drainage areas are shown on an accompanying plan within the supporting information to Policy DM9 of the DMP. It shows the appeal site to be within one of these critical drainage areas.

7. The proposal was supported by a Flood Risk Assessment (the FRA). However, the Council's Drainage Team has objected on the basis that insufficient information has been provided in respect of Compensatory Flood Storage, Mitigation Measures, Flood Maps/Data and Drainage Details.
8. I have had regard to the submitted FRA, which the appellant states provides a comprehensive assessment of flood risk and drainage strategy to satisfactorily mitigate surface water flood risk and to ensure no increased flood risk elsewhere. However, the FRA states that the Surface Water Flood Risk is 'Low to Medium', which is at odds with the classification identified by the Council and Drainage Authority. Therefore, I cannot be certain the risk of flooding has been satisfactorily considered having regard to the correct Flood Map data.
9. The appellant also states that the proposed extension does not displace any existing floodplain, nor does it result in a reduction of flood storage capacity. However, the proposed development would involve the enlargement of the existing dwelling to provide a ground floor extension measuring approximately 27m². This would reduce the garden area of the property, and as a result the land available for surface water storage when flooding occurs.
10. I have not been provided with any detailed mapping of the flood zones, nor the depth of any surface water flooding which is likely to occur at the appeal site and the relationship to the proposed development. Therefore, whilst I acknowledge that the appellant has stated that they are willing to provide additional information including an updated flood depth map and overlay of the extension footprint, this has not been provided with the appeal.
11. Whilst the application form specifies that surface water is to drain via a soakaway, it is unclear how effective this would be, or how it could affect flood risk at, and beyond the appeal site. The appellant also states that allowances have been made for climate change and that the remaining parts of the garden will be retained as permeable surfaces. However, none of the additional information required by the Council has been provided. Therefore, I find that the FRA does not contain sufficient information to accurately assess and manage surface water, along with any associated flood risks that could arise.
12. Taking into account the above, and based on the evidence provided, I therefore conclude that in the absence of a satisfactory site-specific flood risk assessment there is insufficient information to accurately assess the flood risks of the proposed development. Thus, the proposed development would be contrary to Policy SI 12 of the London Plan 2021, Policy CS1 of the Harrow Core Strategy (adopted February 2012) and Policies DM9 and DM10 of the DMP, which require amongst other things, all development to be resistant and resilient to all relevant sources of flooding including surface water and not to increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.

Other Matters

13. The Council has raised no concerns relating to the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, fire safety or the living

conditions of neighbouring occupiers. However, these matters do not either individually or collectively outweigh the identified conflicts above.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons, the proposed development conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Lancaster

INSPECTOR