



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2022

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3298925

12 The Greenway, Rayners Lane, Pinner HA5 5DR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Karima Khandker against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/0181/22, dated 19 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2010 ('SPD') states that extensions should harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building and with the character of the area. At paragraph 6.66 it observes that roofs make a significant contribution to an area's character.
4. At paragraph 6.57 it sets out that where a property has already been extended by the conversion of a hipped to a gabled roof, a further side extension is inappropriate, as such development can be incompatible with the design, character, bulk and appearance of the locality.
5. The host forms one half of a semi-detached pair which are located on a crescent behind a landscaped amenity space off Rayners Lane. The dwellings here are semi-detached and set back to varying degrees from the highway. Other than Nos 8 and 12, the principal parts of the houses have a hipped roofed form, and notwithstanding various alterations and extensions, they are of a broadly consistent architectural style. That includes No 10, whose large two storey side extension has at least the appearance of a hipped roof, as does the nearby first floor side extension at 508 Rayners Lane.
6. The original building at No 12 has already been extended with a hip to gable conversion and a large rear dormer. The proposed extension would be narrow, subserviently set down from the host's ridge, its front face would be slightly

- recessed to provide articulation, and it would have matching facing materials and fenestration. Viewed in isolation it would be of an appropriate design.
7. However, in the context of The Greenway this is a relatively prominent plot next to a corner. In this setting, whilst the scheme's gabled form would integrate with the host's current design, it would draw attention to the property's contrasting form compared to virtually all the other dwellings on The Greenway. Additionally, given that No 11 has not been similarly extended to the side, and that it retains its original hipped roof, it would further erode the cohesion and symmetry of this semi-detached pair.
 8. Having regard to cumulative impacts, and to the site's context, the scheme would consequently detract from the streetscene. It would therefore significantly harm the character and appearance of the area, and it would conflict with the advice in the SPD.
 9. Both principal parties have cited appeal decisions in favour of their case. However, I do not have the full details of all those examples, or know all their context. I have therefore dealt with this proposal in this location on its merits.
 10. In broad terms, and amongst other things, Policy D3 Parts D1) and D11) of The London Plan 2021, Policy CS1 Part B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012, and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies 2013, require proposals to be of a high design standard, and to respond to local distinctiveness and character, having regard to matters such as appearance and shape. The National Planning Policy Framework also requires development to be sympathetic to local character and to maintain a strong sense of place. For the above reasons, the scheme would conflict with those policies.
 11. The scheme would provide enhanced and enlarged living accommodation for the appellant and her family. However, that private benefit does not outweigh the significant harm that it would cause to the public realm, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR