



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 9 November 2020

by A Parkin BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3259343

1 Chelston Approach, Ruislip, Middlesex HA4 9RY

- 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 Manoj Shah against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 10531/APP/2020/1421, dated 29 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension, part two storey, part single storey rear extension and two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a predominantly residential area on the edge of Ruislip Manor town centre, which contains a range of retail properties along Victoria Road to the west. The town centre extends northwards from a landscaped roundabout a short distance from the appeal site. Visually prominent 3-storey brick buildings curve around the roundabout on either side of Victoria Road, with the eastern building extending close to the boundary of the appeal site.
4. The appeal property is at the western end of a short terrace of traditional, 2-storey, garden-fronted dwellings. Whilst each of the four dwellings in the terrace has a different appearance, for instance some dwellings, including the appeal building, have porches, there remains a considerable visual balance to the terrace.
5. The dwellings all have 2-storey curved bay features to the front, with the two end-terraced properties containing gable features above, whilst the curved bays in the next door properties in the centre of the terrace have smaller-scale hipped roof features above. Both of the end-terraced buildings have hipped roofs and from the front the roofscape is largely unaltered.
6. The proposed development would entail a substantial 2-storey hipped-roofed extension to the side and rear of the appeal dwelling, which would extend a short distance to the front at ground floor level, by the existing porch.

7. Whilst the proposed hipped-roof would not be out-of-keeping with the design of the appeal dwelling or the terrace, it would continue the existing roof ridgeline and so would not be subordinate to the host building. Similarly, the proposed extension would not be set back from the front elevation and would not, therefore, be seen as subservient.
8. The proposal would extend over the existing driveway to the side of the building and would be more than half the width of the appeal dwelling, leaving a gap of only around 150mm between the boundary with the next door commercial property. This would significantly reduce the space between these buildings, creating a somewhat cramped appearance along this part of the street.
9. The appellant refers to the Council's guideline gap being 250mm. I cannot find such a reference in the development plan. However, the development plan¹ does require a minimum gap of one metre to the property boundary for 2-storey side extensions such as this, substantially more than is proposed.
10. The cumulative impact of the scale, massing and position of the proposed development would make it an incongruous and disproportionate addition to the appeal dwelling, which would be readily visible in views from the front and to a lesser extent the rear². Furthermore, in views from the front it would also detract from the balance of the short terrace, to the further detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
11. I note the appellant's comments regarding compliance with 'most' of the development plan policies referenced by the Council on its Decision Notice. Whilst there are aspects of the proposal that would comply with some parts of the development plan, the evidence shows that there would also be conflicts, as set out above, which in my view would be more significant.
12. For these reasons the proposed development would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area. It would, therefore, conflict with Policy BE1 (Built Environment) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies November 2012 and with Policies DMHB11 (Design of New Development) and DMHD1 of the HLP2DMP.
13. Policy DMHB12 (Streets and Public Realm) of the HLP2DMP is not relevant to the appeal development.

Other Matters

14. I note the reference to the appeal site containing a TPO protected tree in the rear garden. When I visited the site, this tree had been removed and I note the appellant's comments regarding its removal. This matter does not affect my determination of the appeal.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Parkin

INSPECTOR

¹ Part C iv) of Policy DMHD1 (Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings) of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies January 2020 (HLP2DMP)

² Including from Dulverton Road.