



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2025

by **B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/25/3374466

113 Village Way, Pinner, Harrow, HA5 5AA.

- 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 Prakash Patel against the decision of Harrow Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/0725/25.
 - The development proposed is erection of single-storey front extension incorporating porch, first floor side to rear extension, alterations to roof to front and rear roof slopes to form front and rear dormers.
-

Procedural Matters

1. The description set out above is taken from the refusal notice for more accurately identifying the extent of the proposed built development than the description on the application form.
2. Reference is made in the evidence to a previous proposal for a front extension to the appeal property. This was dismissed at appeal Ref APP/M5450/D/23/3321073. However, I have considered the present proposal afresh on its individual planning merits.

Decision

3. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect the proposed development would have on the character and appearance of No 113 Village Way itself, the semi-detached pair of which it forms part with No 115, and the wider street scene of Village Way.

Reasons

5. The proposed front extension would be wider than the existing flat-roofed porch and would project slightly forward of the adjacent bay window. The mono-pitch roof would rise higher than the present porch and partially reduce the area of the catslide roof of the main front-facing gable of the house.
6. At first floor level, the extension would project forward of the present elevation, removing much of the catslide roof and creating a crown roof profile in place of the current ridge.
7. At the rear, the first-floor extension would enlarge the existing roof dormer to the full width of the house, again reducing the downward sweep of the catslide roof, including in views of the side elevation.

8. The essential question for this appeal is whether the altered roof profile of No 113 would overwhelm its architectural style, and its catslide roof profiles in particular, to be unacceptably out of keeping with its neighbour at No 115 or the wider street scene.
9. Village Way is characterised by semi-detached pairs of dwellings featuring front gables and sweeping catslide roofs, albeit these are less prevalent east of Exchange Walk where the appeal property is situated. Importantly though, the numerous previous extensions to the houses in this part of Village Way, including at No 115 adjoining the appeal dwelling, have invariably retained the essential catslide roof profiles, especially as viewed from the street.
10. The Council has no objection to the front extension in itself and, in my own view, any degree of loss of symmetry or visual harmony it would cause at ground floor level would not be unacceptable, compared with No 115 and the present street context.
11. However, at second floor level, a large part of the front catslide roof would be removed, with only a small section remaining visible at the side of the gable. At the side and rear, the evident reduction in the sweep of the roof would be less visible from the street, as would the uncharacteristic crown roof, but these features would still be noticeable.
12. Overall, I consider that, in important street views especially, the proposed alterations to No 113 Village Way would be unacceptably out of keeping with the character and appearance of the host dwelling itself, its neighbour at No 115 and the local street scene in general, despite the varied extensions to many other properties in the vicinity.
13. For this reason, I find that the proposed development would be in significant conflict with the relevant provisions of Harrow Core Strategy CS1 and adopted Development Management Policy D1. These policies, supplemented by design guidance and consistent with London Plan Policy D3 and the National Planning Policy Framework, seek high quality development with extensions harmonising with their host and respecting local character.
14. I have considered every matter raised in connection with appeal proposals, including the concerns of neighbours at No111 Village Way about the implications for their property and also the potential flood risk affecting the area. Like the Council, I am satisfied that both neighbouring amenity and flood risk would be addressed by due compliance with the construction and flood defence details shown on the approved plans.
15. However, there is no other matter to affect my conclusion that, for reason explained in connection with main issue of character and appearance, this appeal should be dismissed.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR