



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2023

by A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/23/3322454

Martinhoe, East End Way, PINNER HA5 3BS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mohamed Bharadia against the decision of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref P/0053/23, dated 6 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 16 March 2023.
The development proposed is first floor front extension; internal alterations; additional rooflights in front and crown roof, additional/ repositioning of Windows; other
 - approved alterations retained (as per approved application reference no. P/2741/22)
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor front extension; internal alterations; additional rooflights in front and crown roof, additional/ repositioning of windows; other approved alterations retained (as per approved application reference no. P/2741/22) at Martinhoe, East End Way, PINNER HA5 3BS in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: P/0053/23 dated 6 January 2023 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PN003, PN007, PN008, PN009, PN010, PN011.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and reenacting that order with or without modification), no window(s)/door(s), other than those shown on the approved plans shall be installed in the flank elevation(s) of the development hereby permitted without the prior permission in writing of the local planning authority.
 - 5) No part of any roof of the development hereby permitted shall be used as a balcony, for sitting out and shall not be accessed other than for the purposes of repair and maintenance.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. East End Way is a short private residential road providing access to a range of large houses of individual design. Martinhoe is a substantial, vacant ¹ property located close to the end of that road in a large plot. Due to the underlying topography the house is set significantly below road level such that its lower storey is largely screened by frontage hedging and other greenery. East End Way is populated by houses of individual design. Many of these retain a demonstrable, if much-diluted, influence from the Arts and Crafts movement at the turn from 19th to 20th century which largely guided, albeit in derivative form, the great expansion of city suburbs in the first half of the 20th Century. Individually designed houses of that period had more scope to adopt these influences and some of those elements are found in Martinghoe.
4. The Council have previously granted permission for substantial alterations and extensions² incorporating a significant enlargement of the roof with raised eaves and steepening of pitch to create a large additional roof volume but also a rearranged fenestration pattern which introduces pretensions of classicism. Whilst the projecting wings of the original design are, to a degree, seen to be retained in that previous permission, the simple and modestly-scaled hipped roof forms, abbreviated first floor headroom with windows sitting tightly under the eaves and prominent brick chimneys that exemplified the informality which underpinned the original design have been entirely dispensed with in the approved design(s). The Council assert that the proposal which is subject to this appeal would subsume the original dwelling and fail to respond positively to the design of the host building, which aligns with my own assessment.
5. However, and notwithstanding these reservations, it is clear that the character and appearance of the original building would be significantly and harmfully changed by what has already been approved. So, to the extent that there appears to be a real prospect of implementation of that previously approved scheme, this is a matter to which I must give significant weight.
6. In addition to these already permitted works³, the proposal would infill between the two main wings at two storeys, with equivalent additional roof volume, presenting a symmetrical frontage (albeit set down from road level and partly screened) with a centralised main entrance and an indented first floor. Whilst I note the appellant suggests such symmetry is, in some way, an 'improved architectural design' that is to misapprehend the inherent qualities of the original building, which, by the consents previously granted, are very likely to be extinguished, although the low setting of Martinhoe reduces the visual impact of the additional mass and imposing formality of the main elevation upon the street scene. It is on that basis I conclude that the proposal falls short of compliance with the aspirations for good design set out in national policy and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) (DMLP) which seeks a high standard of design that is not detrimental to local character and appearance.
7. Bearing in mind the appeal site is neither a listed building or within a Conservation Area or its setting, my reasoning shows very little, if any, additional planning harm arises from differences between what has been

¹ At the time of the site visit the house appeared unsuitable for occupation due to ongoing works

² P/4207/22 and P/2741/22.

³ P2741/22

already approved, the fallback position, and what is now proposed. In consequence the weight which must be applied to this conflict is very limited and outweighed by the admittedly modest economic and social benefits of bringing the existing house back into use.

8. Therefore, taking into account all matters raised, the appeal succeeds subject to the usual timing and plans conditions. Given the basis of my decision I have also considered, adjusted and attached as necessary, conditions to which previous approvals were subject to ensure appropriate consistency.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR