



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 August 2025

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/25/3369375

72 West Avenue, Rayners Lane, Harrow, HA5 5BX

- 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 Henry Azariah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/0470/25.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a front porch, first-floor front to side extension, single and two-storey rear extension, external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to one half of a semi-detached pair which have a distinctive shared two-storey central feature with double-height bay windows under a hipped roof and long sloping 'cat-slide' roofs and recessed wings to each side, with eaves at ground-floor level. This same design approach appears at intervals along the east side of West Avenue, where the appeal property is positioned, and within the wider area, where properties are generally of similar age but of mixed appearance and type, often with repeat designs intermingled.
4. The Council has raised no concern with the proposed front porch extension, the single-storey rear extension, or the first-floor extensions to the rear. I have no reasons to disagree with regard to any of these elements, which would integrate themselves reasonably well with the existing property.
5. Part of the proposal is to increase the size and quality of the existing living space at first-floor level. This would include a roof extension across the full width of the front facing roof slope of the recessed wing which would project forward to be set just marginally back from the front bay, and which would have a flat crown roof, first-floor eaves height, and a single window aligned with one similar below.
6. During my visit, I was struck by how catslide roofs and low eaves heights were strong and unifying features of West Avenue, despite the variety of property types.

Notwithstanding some past alterations to No 72, its original form remains dominant and contributes positively to the cohesion of the street scene.

7. The proposed front roof extension would significantly remodel the appearance of the appeal property. The low eaves would be lost in favour of a front elevation that would be obviously two-storey in scale and form, amplified by both the uncharacteristic expanse of facing render and the introduction of a window at original roof level. Further still, the flat crown would be an incongruous and alien configuration that would appear as a poorly conceived adjunct with little respect for the original architectural composition of the pair, or the harmony of the street scene.
8. I recognise that many similar properties within the wider area have undergone extensive alterations. With this in mind and having regard also to the variety of house types locally, I place little significance to the symmetry of Nos 72 and 74. I saw many examples where original symmetry between attached pairs had been lost. Nevertheless, in the vast majority of cases I saw a balanced outcome, where modifications were successfully integrated into the fabric of the original structure as part of an overall cohesive design. A few examples locally were less successful and demonstrated to me how poorly designed additions can negatively impact the quality of the built environment.
9. In this case, I find the proposal to be neither a modest roof addition nor a comprehensive remodel that would create a well-balanced and co-ordinated semi-detached pair. Whilst the proposed front roof extension may be subordinate in size to the dwelling as a whole, and notwithstanding the use of matching materials, it would stand dominant within the front roof slope and would be visually intrusive within the street scene. This would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of No 72 and the wider area. As such, it would fail to meet the objectives of the Council's *Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document* (2010) as far as it seeks to ensure residential extensions harmonise with the scale and style of the original building and the character of the area. There would therefore be conflict with Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021), Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), and Policy DM1 of the Council's Development Management Policies (2013). Between them, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure that new development achieves a high standard of design that responds positively to local distinctiveness. For these same reasons there would be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed places.

Other Matter

10. I have noted an objection concerned with overlooking properties to the rear of the site from the proposed first-floor extension to the rear. However, this would amount to an extension of an existing rear facing first-floor element. With this in mind and having regard also to the depth of the rear garden and separation distances involved, I share the Council's view that there would be no degree of overlooking that would be harmful to the living conditions of any neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

11. I recognise that the proposed works would create additional space for the appellant's family needs, but these factors do not outweigh the harm that I have

identified or the conflict with the development plan. Accordingly, for the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR