



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 April 2021

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3265714
398 Field End Road, Ruislip, HA4 9PF

- 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 and Mrs Kumar de Silva against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 42967/APP/2020/2182, dated 15 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension, single storey rear extension and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey side extension, single storey rear extension and front porch at 398 Field End Road, Ruislip, HA4 9PF in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 42967/APP/2020/2182 dated 15 July 2020 and in accordance with the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision;
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: P9/004 and P9/005.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling situated in a spacious, wedge-shaped corner plot on the south side of Field End Road close to its junction with Ferncroft Avenue. The dwelling is of brick and render construction, with a two storey bay and curved building line to the front, a feature which is replicated in the adjoining semi-detached property.
-

4. The appeal property is located in a residential area characterised by the presence of two storey semi-detached dwellings set back from the road behind the pavement, grass verges and front gardens and/or parking areas. Houses have longer gardens to the rear. Together, these features provide for a pleasant sense of uniformity, spaciousness and greenery.
5. During my site visit I observed that many dwellings have been altered and/or extended. Indeed, the adjoining semi-detached property to the appeal property has a two storey extension to the side. This results in the pair of semi-detached properties having an asymmetrical appearance.
6. The proposed development would extend the appeal property to the side in a similar manner to the extension to the adjoining semi-detached property. In direct contrast to the observations of the Council, I find that this would make a significant positive contribution to the symmetry of this pair of semi-detached houses and in so doing would complement the sense of uniformity that is characteristic of the area.
7. Whilst the proposed extension would be wider than half the width of the original property, it would only be slightly so. Further, the overall design of the proposal, with its set-back, roof height below the main ridge and retention of the curved building line to the front, is such that the proposal would not appear dominant, bulky or incongruous but would comprise a sensitively designed extension that would appear subservient to the host property and in keeping with its adjoining neighbour and the surrounding area.
8. In addition to the above, I find that the overall size, wedge-shape and corner facing nature of the appeal property's plot is such that the proposed development would sit comfortably within it.
9. Taking all of this into account, I find that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposed development would not be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework or to Local Plan¹ Policy BE1, or to Development Management² Policies DMHB11 and DMHD1, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the tests set out in Paragraph 55 of the Framework. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
11. A condition requiring materials to match those of the existing house is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the host property and wider area.

¹ Reference: Hillingdon Local Plan Part One – Strategic Policies (2012).

² Reference: Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020).

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal succeeds.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR