



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 July 2023

by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15.12.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/23/3321073

113 Village Way, Pinner, Harrow HA5 5AA

- 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 Prakash Patel against the decision of the London Borough of Harrow Council.
 - The application Ref P/3477/22, dated 3 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 23 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is part first floor front extension, part ground floor front extension, external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. These are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the pair of semi-detached houses comprising 113 and 115 Village Way.

Reasons

3. The road contains properties of varied design, some of which have undergone alterations, including roof level extensions in assorted styles. Whilst there is no longer a cohesive style of house design that needs to be slavishly replicated or preserved in order to retain local character, notable design features should be respected.
4. The catslide roofs at the appeal property and its two immediate neighbours are a design feature significant to local character. The appellant acknowledges this. No 115 looks different to No 113 due to its roof, side and porch extensions. However, the roof retains an extensive front slope which reflects the original catslide design. Despite their detailed design differences, the properties are still read as a pair.
5. The first-floor front extension would result in the total loss of the catslide roof. The extension would be set down from the roof ridge and would be behind the front elevation. However, the width and design of the front extension would not be subservient to the scale of the host dwelling. The proposed changes would considerably exceed just minor differences in detail. They would alter the overall design of the property to such a degree that it would have a vastly different and incongruous appearance. The perception of the houses as a semi-

detached pair would be lost. The resulting elevation would jar within the context of both adjacent houses to the detriment of local character.

6. The appellant refers to a 2016 appeal relating to extensions to a property in Church Avenue. Due to the passage of time, that appeal was determined against a different local and national planning policy context. Few specific details of the case have been provided, but in any event, the site context differs from the appeal before me. Accordingly, the historic appeal decision can be given little weight in the current appeal.
7. I conclude that the proposed front extension and associated alterations to the roof would alter the dwellinghouse in an obtrusive and incongruous manner. It would unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties and would appear out of character in the street scene. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the high-quality design aspirations of Core Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy (2012), Policy DM1 A, DM1 B (a), (b) and (c) of the Harrow Development Management Policies Local Plan (2013) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Guide (2010). It would conflict with the similar requirements of Policy D3 (D(1) and D(11)) of The London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).
8. For the reasons set out, the appeal is dismissed.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR