



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2026

by **N Armstrong BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/W/25/3375358

70 Salisbury Road, Harrow HA1 1NZ

- 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 Mendel Moses against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
- The application Ref is PL/0642/25.
- The development proposed is single-storey side and rear infill extension, hip-to-gable roof conversion and dormer extension and the change of use from a small HMO (Class C4) to a large HMO (sui-generis) with refuse and cycle storage.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I observed at my site visit that some development had taken place. This included works to the roof comprising the hip-to-gable and dormer extensions, which appeared to be those shown in the submitted plans. The evidence indicates that a certificate of lawful development has been granted for works to the roof¹. The proposed single-storey side and rear infill extensions form part of the proposal, although these had not been commenced. The Council has not objected to these aspects of the application and following my site visit and having seen their relationship with adjoining neighbours, I see no reason to disagree. Consequently, the external physical works to the building are judged to be satisfactory. Parts of the ground floor internal layout did not reflect the layout shown on the existing floor plans. However, I have dealt with the appeal on the basis that planning permission is sought for the development shown in the plans before me.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to refuse and cycle storage;
 - whether or not the development would provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation for its future occupiers, with particular regard to outlook, privacy and light to bedrooms and communal areas; and
 - the effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring residents, with particular regard to noise and disturbance.

¹ Application ref PL/0253/25

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached property within an established residential area. There are variations in house types along Salisbury Road, although properties are predominantly set back from the street with modest sized gardens and parking areas situated to the frontages. There are trees within the front garden of the appeal property, two of which are relatively large in size, situated to the boundary with Salisbury Road, which dominate the site frontage. These currently sit alongside the remains of a small section of low wall and railing.
5. The appellant describes the lawful use of the existing property as a small house in multiple occupation (HMO) for six occupants that benefits from a valid HMO licence, which is not disputed by the Council. The development proposes a change of use of the property with an increase to eight occupants, and the plans indicate provision for refuse and cycle storage in timber enclosures to the front of the site.
6. The siting of refuse bins is prevalent to the front of properties on Salisbury Road, albeit with predominantly less than the number proposed in the appeal scheme. From what I was able to observe, generally bins appeared to be stored in the open, and a considerable number of properties do not feature any boundary treatment to their frontage with the footway. Enclosed structures for bin or cycle storage are not characteristic features to property frontages.
7. There is no dispute between the parties that the proposal would meet the development plan requirement for the provision of cycle parking. However, the submitted plans show that the cycle storage would comprise a large structure for this area situated to the front boundary of the property. The storage would have a maximum height of 2.6 metres, extending along a considerable part of the boundary with the adjoining footway. This would introduce an incongruous form of development into a highly prominent location in the street scene where there is an absence of similar development, which would harm the character and appearance of the area.
8. The appellant's evidence suggests that the storage would be located discreetly behind a low wall and protected trees, which it is argued would provide partial screening. While there is some mixed information, the officer report states that there are two large TPO (Tree Preservation Order) trees to the front forecourt of the site. From the information before me and my site visit, it is not clear how the cycle storage could be constructed as proposed without impacting on existing trees. Furthermore, based on the submitted plans and its proposed siting, I am not satisfied that the trees and low wall would screen the cycle storage and adequately mitigate the harmful visual impact in the street scene. Although a condition could potentially secure further details of cycle storage, from the information before me, I cannot be certain that a suitable overall scheme would be achieved at the site.
9. The increased number of bins to serve the more intensive proposed use would be stored in a reasonably low and modest timber structure along the side boundary. This would add to the visual clutter in this area to some degree; however, sections of the bin store would be set back from the front boundary, adjoin the side timber boundary fence, and its overall visual impact would be satisfactory in relation to the character and appearance of the street scene.

10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area, because of the proposed cycle storage. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021) (the LP) and Policies DM 1, DM 26 and DM 30 of the Harrow Council Development Management Policies (2013) (the DMP). Amongst other things, these policies aim for development to enhance local context, positively respond to local distinctiveness, respond to the existing character of a place, resist development detrimental to local character, ensure any external alterations do not detract from the street scene, and avoid adverse impact on the character of the area.

Living conditions – future occupiers

11. The proposal would make provision for accommodation that meets relevant internal space standards. However, there is dispute regarding the privacy that would be afforded to occupants of rooms 01, 02 and 03 and the outlook and light to the kitchen and communal room.
12. As rooms 01, 02 and 03 would face towards the front and rear garden areas, there would be some potential for loss of privacy for occupants of these due to use of the external areas. Notwithstanding my findings above in respect of the proposed cycle storage, given the smaller area of the front garden and its set back from the pavement and road, there would likely be less activity that may impact on future occupants in this area. Lawful use of the property as a small HMO would also allow for room 01 to be used as a bedroom.
13. However, there would be potential for greater impacts on privacy to proposed rooms 02 and 03 within the ground floor rear extension from use of the rear garden. There would be potential for greater use of the adjoining section of the rear garden due to the increase in the number of occupants of the HMO, which would likely result in adverse effects on the privacy of future occupants of these rooms. The proposed plans do not indicate any provision for features that would adequately mitigate the potential for such effects. Despite the large size of the garden area, I also have no satisfactory information before me to demonstrate that a suitable scheme could be achieved. Therefore, as proposed, the development would likely have a harmful effect on the future occupants of those rooms. This harm would not be outweighed by the development meeting or exceeding other aspects of living standards.
14. Rooms 02 and 03 would be accessed from the rear of the main communal ground floor space, close to the side external doors. These rooms would be close to the communal space and associated activity, although they would be enclosed from this area. In the absence of compelling evidence to demonstrate otherwise, I do not find that this particular element would result in an unacceptable layout for future occupants of those rooms or significant harm, with particular regard to privacy.
15. Due to its central location on the ground floor, the proposed kitchen and communal room would have a limited and poor outlook and access to daylight. It would only be served by double doors leading to the narrow access to the side of the property, which would be in proximity to the boundary and side elevation of No 68. However, the proposed kitchen and communal room would provide a generous space that exceeds the relevant minimum size standards referenced in the evidence. Furthermore, occupants would also have bedrooms that meet or exceed the

relevant standards, as well as access to a large garden area, which taken together, weigh in favour of the scheme. For these reasons, despite the limited outlook and access to daylight, I consider that the proposed kitchen and communal room would be an adequate space for future occupants.

16. Notwithstanding my findings that some aspects of the layout would be acceptable, I conclude that the proposed development would not provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation overall for its future occupiers, with particular regard to privacy for occupants of rooms 02 and 03. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy D3 of the LP and Policy DM 1 of the DMP, which aim for development to deliver appropriate outlook, privacy and amenity, achieve indoor environments that are comfortable and inviting for people to use, and a high standard of layout, privacy and amenity.

Living conditions – neighbouring residents

17. I observed the area of the site and its immediate surroundings on Salisbury Road to be a relatively quiet neighbourhood. I have limited information to demonstrate how properties are occupied in this area, although they appear to predominantly comprise single dwellings and some indication of flats. Given that the property presently can be occupied as a small HMO with the potential for six residents, the proposal would see a modest increase in occupancy of two residents at the property.
18. The occupants of the enlarged HMO would live as separate households with individual living, working and social patterns, and such use would be more intensive with activity from comings and goings compared to use as a single dwelling. However, the evidence indicates that the property is already in a lawful HMO use, which is a significant material consideration.
19. Additional activity to the front of the property would likely be limited to comings and goings onto Salisbury Road, similar to the arrangements for surrounding properties. Due to its size, additional activity in the rear garden by up to eight occupants would not necessarily be concentrated in a small area close to neighbouring residents. Compared with the existing HMO, the proposed larger HMO at this semi-detached property, with its size of garden and with the building set back from the road, would not be an over intensive use of the site. I am satisfied that the increase in occupancy over the present use should not result in undue additional noise and disturbance that would be overly intensive and that would result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents.
20. The Council refer to the dismissed appeal at 3 Lyncroft Avenue², which appears to relate to a change of use from a dwelling to an HMO for occupancy by a maximum of 10 people. This is a more intensive scheme than the present appeal proposal and each property will have its own situation and characteristics, in this case there was an issue with car parking for instance. In this case, the appeal scheme before me relates to a lower number of occupants, and the appeal property is already in use as an HMO. I therefore give the cited appeal decision limited weight.
21. I have also had regard to concerns raised by interested parties, which include an increase in HMOs, poor management leading to antisocial behaviour, overdevelopment, loss of privacy, car parking and the use being unsuitable in this

² Appeal ref: APP/M5450/W/20/3256326

location. However, I do not consider that an HMO of the size proposed would be an overdevelopment of the site and should necessarily cause harm to the living conditions of neighbours or the wider area.

22. In light of the above analysis, I conclude that the proposed development would have a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties such that there should not be an unacceptable adverse impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents, with particular regard to noise and disturbance. The proposal would therefore accord with Policies D3 and D14 of the LP and Policies DM 1, DM 26 and DM 30 of the DMP. Amongst other things, these policies aim for development to achieve inclusive environments, achieve a high standard of amenity, prevent or mitigate impacts of noise, and avoid proposals that would be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and an over intensive conversion.

Other Matters

23. In dismissing the appeal, I have had regard to the appeal decisions provided with the appellant's appeal statement. These relate to locations outside of the borough and other parts of the country at 95 Bradford Street, 14 Gordons, 232 Oldham Road, 11 York Road, 44 Lambert Road, 23 Downs Road, 287 Castle Road, 22 Sidney Road and 19 Castle Dene. The appellant also references an appeal at Boxtree Road, which is not before me.
24. Where I have identified harm, the decisions before me do not appear to address the same main issues as this appeal, particularly the effects of the proposed cycle storage on the area's character and appearance, or whether future occupiers would have a satisfactory standard of accommodation with regard to privacy. The decisions at 232 Oldham Road, 11 York Road, 44 Lambert Road, 22 Sidney Road and 287 Castle Road indicate that the proposed cycle storage provision in those cases was either acceptable or details could be conditioned. However, they relate to different schemes that will all have their own individual and site-specific circumstances. I therefore cannot draw any direct comparisons from these with the scheme before me that would weigh in its favour where I have found harm. I have assessed the scheme before me based on its own site-specific circumstances.
25. I have had regard to the appellant's comments that the proposal would support mixed housing types and the intensification of underused sites. However, the existing HMO use and the scale of development means any associated benefits would be limited, and these would not outweigh the harm that I have found.

Conclusion

26. Notwithstanding my findings on the third main issue, I find harm to the character and appearance of the area from the proposed cycle storage and in relation to the living conditions for some future occupants of the development. These are significant shortcomings of the scheme and are such that the proposal would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Armstrong

INSPECTOR