

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2022

by G Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3292358

28 Manor Road, Ruislip HA4 7LB

- 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 & Mrs K Sadler against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 75898/APP/2021/1062, dated 17 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension, conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a front dormer, 4 rooflights and rear roof alteration from hipped to gable end. Relocation of side entry door to front elevation and internal layout remodelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension, conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a front dormer, 4 rooflights and rear roof alteration from hipped to gable end. Relocation of side entry door to front elevation and internal layout remodelling at 28 Manor Road, Ruislip HA4 7LB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 75898/APP/2021/1062, dated 17 March 2021, 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:

Existing Site & Location Plan (A-0001 Rev 02); Proposed Site & Location Plan (A-0002 Rev 02); Existing Ground Floor Plan (A-0200 Rev 00); Existing Roof Plan (A-0201 Rev 00); Existing East & West Elevations (A-0202 Rev 00); Existing North & South Elevations (A-0203 Rev 00); Proposed Ground Floor Plan (A-0300 Rev 00); Proposed First Floor Plan (A-0301 Rev 00); Proposed Roof Plan (A-0302 Rev 00); Proposed East & West Elevations (A-0303 Rev 00); Proposed North & South Elevations (A-0304 Rev 00) and Existing & Proposed Manor Road Elevations (A-0305 Rev 00)

except in respect of the roof tile details shown on the following plans: A-0304 Rev 00 and A-0303 Rev 00.

- 3) No development shall commence until details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the roof of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and samples.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modest detached bungalow set within a residential street of varied scale and architectural style. Flanked by larger two storey properties, its relatively plain façade gives the building an unassuming presence within the street frontage.
4. The proposal would not compromise the simple sense of balance currently presented by the building's façade. The introduction of a front entrance door would not unduly challenge the elevation's simple, balanced fenestration, whilst the 'crittal style' windows would not be harmfully out of keeping with the style, scale or general age of the host property. I am satisfied therefore that these elements of the proposal would retain the essential character of the appeal property and would not cause harm to its appearance, or to that of the wider street.
5. With regard to the proposed front dormer window, I am also satisfied that it would broadly reflect the style, scale and proportions of those found elsewhere within the street, including those on other similarly proportioned and detailed bungalows. Moreover, the dormer window would also be of a scale that would retain the distinctive small, peaked element atop the otherwise hipped roof slope. Indeed, dormer windows and peaked gables are typical of many properties along Manor Road where broken and punctuated roof slopes are a common and prevailing architectural detail.
6. I recognise that Local Plan Part 2 (LP2) policy DMHD1(E) seeks to direct dormer windows to the rear elevations of buildings. However, modest dormer windows, and other interventions to front roof slopes, are not uncommon and add to the varied character of the street's roofscape. Notwithstanding a technical breach of LP2 policy DMHD1(E) in this respect, I am satisfied that no harm would arise from this element of the proposal in terms of the character or appearance of the host property or the wider streetscene.
7. An existing chimney stack on the roof frontage would be removed to facilitate the construction of the dormer window. However, I do not consider the presence of a chimney stack here to be central to the building's character or contribution to the Manor Road streetscene and so its removal would not be fatal to the proposal.
8. At the rear, the effects of the hip-to-gable roof alteration and single storey flat roofed rear extension would be more significant and transformative of the building's essential character. However, the single storey element of the extension would be of limited depth even if it would extend across the entire width of the rear of the property and would not appear excessively large in the context of outbuildings and build-outs at the neighbouring properties.
9. With regard to the roof alteration, the rear portion of the building's roof would clearly gain considerable mass and bulk from the hip-to-gable extension. However, this would not be excessive in the context of the larger houses that flank No. 28, whilst matching the existing side roof slopes would ensure

continuity with the existing roof. The proposal would alter the composition and proportions of the property's roof but, given their location at the rear of the building and thereby heavily recessed and partly screened in longer views by the larger neighbouring properties, neither element would be disruptive to the scale, spacing around the buildings, or to the character and appearance of No. 28, or its role and presence within Manor Road.

10. I accept therefore that there would be technical breaches of the provisions set out within, particularly, LP2 policy DMHD1(E). However, I am satisfied that the site and design specific circumstances of the appeal proposal are such that it would still comply with the overall design quality aims set out within LP2 policies DMHB1, DMHB4, DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 and with Local Plan Part 1 (LP1) policies BE1 and HE1.
11. I have noted the Council's concern regarding the proposed changes to the nature and colour of the extended building's roof covering. Whilst I find no harm in the proposal's other respects, for the reasons as described above, the indicated use of grey roof tiles would stand starkly at odds with the prevailing use of brown, red or orange pantiles. However, I am satisfied that the imposition of a suitably worded condition to ensure the use of complimentary roof coverings consistent with the area's prevailing character and appearance would not be unduly onerous or restrictive.
12. Taking all of these factors into account, and in exercising the statutory duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, I am satisfied that the proposal would have a neutral effect on the character and appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. As such, it would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Conditions

13. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in light of the advice and guidance set out within the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. I agree that a time limit condition is necessary and reasonable in the interests of good planning and to provide certainty.
14. I have not imposed a matching materials condition, as originally suggested by the Council, as I am satisfied that the submitted plans and elevations show sufficient detail regarding the appellant's intended approach to design and appearance and the materials to be used to achieve that. However, I agree with the Council that the use of a grey roof tile instead of the prevailing orange / brown / dark red pantile would not be appropriate. I have therefore modified the plans condition so as to allow the addition of a materials sample condition in respect of the roof covering.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G Robbie

INSPECTOR