



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2022

By A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3301162
17 Woodridings Avenue, Pinner, HA5 4NQ

- 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 Mr Dupesh Patel against the decision of The London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref: P/0437/22 dated 10 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of roof extension including rear hip-to-gable extension and rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of roof extension including rear hip-to-gable extension and rear dormer at 17 Woodridings Avenue, Pinner, HA5 4NQ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: P/0437/22 dated 10 February 2022 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those found in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 17_WE_EX05; 17_WE_EX06; Existing and proposed left elevation 17_WE_EX10; Existing and proposed right elevation 17_WE_EX11; Existing and proposed front elevation 17_WE_EX08; Existing and proposed rear elevation 17_WE_EX09; Proposed section 17_WE_EX12.

Main Issue:

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

Reasons:

3. 17 Woodridings Avenue (No.17) is located within a quiet cul-de-sac comprised of, predominantly, early twentieth century houses of consistent appearance and good architectural quality in a mature suburban setting and a small number of later dwellings at the end of the Avenue which do not share this distinctive character and appearance.

4. No.17 sits within that smaller grouping, possessing a large rear garden screened from other dwellings. The Council's concern relates mainly to the width of the dormer addition as it extends sideways from a proposed hip to gable extension on the rear roof slopes.
5. Noting the recent large single-storey extension at the rear together with other changes to external appearance, the proposals would, from my observations, alter an already much-changed dwelling in a way which would not impact upon the street scene to any material degree. Although the proposed combination of hip-gable and dormer extension is an unconventional arrangement, the proposal does not disproportionately add to the already much-altered and extended building form or its footprint. The changes would not be prominent. In my judgement, little planning harm would result in these particular circumstances, which are not, from my observations, likely to be shared by other dwellings in the street.
6. Policy DM 1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010) seek high standards of design and to prevent the erosion of locally distinctive character and appearance. Such policies are not lightly to be set aside in that they align with the principles of achieving sustainable development set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. In this case, however, for the reasons I have given, those objectives would not be achieved by refusing the proposal which would provide additional accommodation and a small degree of economic benefit from construction activity. Therefore, on balance, I conclude there would be no conflict with the development plan.
7. Consequently, for all the reasons given, the appeal should succeed.
8. In addition to the usual time limit, conditions are necessary to ensure the development is carried out on the basis by which I have reached my conclusions and that would require a plans condition and a requirement to use matching materials. Although the Council have suggested removing permitted development rights I am not convinced that such a condition would meet the test of necessity in this situation.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR