



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2024

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/24/3347992

64 Church Avenue, Rayners Lane, Harrow HA5 5JF

- 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 Jayson Nathan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/1003/24.
 - The development proposed is a first floor front extension, roof alteration, loft conversion and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property, the semi-detached pair, and the area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The streetscene in this part of Church Avenue is dominated by semi-detached pairs. They typically have a dominant two storey central section with double height bay windows, and recessive long sloping roofs either side with first floor accommodation contained within the roof, leading to an eaves at ground floor level. The host and 62 Church Avenue ('No 62') comprise one such pair, which displays these locally distinctive 'metroland' characteristics. It sits in a fairly prominent position close to the junction with Dewsbury Close.
4. The fenestration of the proposed front extension would reflect existing features in this pair and it would be faced with matching materials. However, the introduction of a second two storey projection, with the consequential loss of the distinctive sloping roof and the increased ridge height to one side, would significantly disrupt the composition and relative symmetry of the building. The resultant property would have a domineering bulk, which would be exacerbated by the extension's projection forward of the existing bay windows, and it would be markedly at odds with its neighbours either side.
5. To the rear, the proposed dormer would cover much of the extended roof, with only narrow gaps to the roof edges. As a result, this half of the building would have a broadly three storey form, thus further disrupting the cohesion and harmony of this pair. None of the photographs of dormers provided by the

- appellant are in the immediate locality, and although some nearby properties, including No 62, have rear dormers, none that I observed are as bulky compared to the one proposed here. The dormer's discordant impact would be clearly apparent when approaching the site from Dewsbury Close.
6. The appellant has also drawn my attention to properties which have had two storey front or side extensions. Some are a distance away, but they include 50, 55 and 56 Church Avenue which are very close to the appeal site, and 196 Whittington Way which is further away in a different streetscene, but which also has a rear dormer. Although 487 Rayners Lane is on the junction with Church Avenue, it is some distance from here, and I have no details of what originally stood on that site.
 7. Whilst these examples serve to illustrate that the area is not totally cohesive, they are not typical of the locality. Moreover, I have very few details to know whether they were all granted planning permission, or what policies and guidance were in place at the time, and they do not serve to justify the harm that would be caused to this building and this streetscene, by this proposal's poor design. For these reasons, the scheme would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host, this semi-detached pair, and the area.
 8. It would thereby conflict with London Plan 2021 Policy D3 Parts D1) and D11), and Harrow Development Management Policies 2013 Policy DM 1. Amongst other things, these require a high standard of design which respects the host building, and responds positively to local character and distinctiveness, and to the context provided by neighbouring buildings, having regard to matters such as building types, form, proportions, massing, bulk, scale, height and appearance.
 9. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework requirement for high quality design which is sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.
 10. Finally, it would fail to accord with the advice in the Harrow Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2010 that extensions should harmonise with the scale and architectural style of the original building and the character of the area, and that they should not dominate the original building or the streetscape; and that roof alterations should complement the original street character, and not dominate buildings or impair their proportions or character.
 11. Having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR