



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2019

by J Evans BA(Hons) AssocRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 June 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3223882

59 St Margarets Road, Ruislip HA4 7NZ

- 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 Amadeep Plaha against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 1190/APP/2018/4268, dated 4 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2019.
- The development proposed is for a single storey front/side/rear extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include 1 front and 2 rear dormers and 5 side rooflights.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front/side/rear extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include 1 front and 2 rear dormers and 5 side rooflights at 59 St Margarets Road, Ruislip HA4 7NZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 1190/APP/2018/4268, dated 4 December 2018, subject to 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: Existing Plans and Elevations (01.01A Revision date 04.12.18); and Proposed Plans, Section and Elevations (03.01 date July 2018).

Procedural Matters

2. The Council altered the description to a 'Single storey front/side/rear extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include 1 front and 2 rear dormers and 5 side rooflights'. The proposal is also described this way on the appellant's appeal form. I consider this to be a more accurate description of the appeal proposal and I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis and used it in my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site concerns a detached single storey bungalow, situated part way along St Margarets Road, which slopes down towards the appeal site from Ladygate Lane to the north. The proposal concerns various alterations to provide enlarged living space at ground floor level and additional living space at first floor level.
5. The character of the area is one of residential properties of a variety of building styles, some of which have been extended and adapted in a manner of ways over time. The appeal site itself is situated amongst a small linear group of single storey bungalows that are relatively consistent in character. However, two properties along, there is a dormer bungalow that is similar in massing and appearance to the proposal before me. During my site visit I also noted that on the opposite side of St Margarets Road, a property was being extended upwards with a dormer window to its front elevation. I also could see several other properties along the road which had been subject to roof extensions and height increases.
6. Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies 2012 (the LP) and Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies 2012 (the UDP) seek, amongst other things, development which improves and maintains the quality of the built environment and harmonises with the existing street scene and original buildings. Paragraph 127 c) of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (the Framework) explains that decisions should ensure that development is sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change.
7. From my appraisal of the appeal site and the surrounding context I am of the view that whilst the proposals would represent a significant enlargement over the existing building, and the introduction of the crown effect flat roofed component is not a prevalent characteristic in the area, there is nevertheless no overriding harm that would arise from the proposal to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The proposal would provide the appeal property with a symmetrical appearance fronting onto the street which would represent an improvement over the existing elevation that presents towards St Margarets Road, which has a disjointed form as a result of the flat roofed garage. Furthermore, there is a variety of building types found along the road and as highlighted above, and similar developments to the proposal exist close by, which ultimately represent a component of its context.
9. I acknowledge that the proposal does not align with some of the specific principles provided within the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions 2008 (the HDAS). However, the HDAS explains that its role is to provide a broad range of principles, rather than imposing rigid controls over detailed design matters.
10. To conclude, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area or the existing building. Consequently, it would accord with Policy BE1 of the LP and Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the UDP, as well as the guidance contained within the HDAS.

Other Matters

11. I note during the processing of the original planning application that a neighbour raised concerns regarding the effects of the proposal upon the foundations of their property. Whilst I appreciate the points raised, these are matters covered through separate legislation to the Planning Acts.
12. I am also aware of several other matters raised, such as those relating to the effects of the proposal on living conditions and biodiversity. Whilst I have given all the points raised careful consideration, they do not materially change my overriding conclusions on the acceptability of the appeal development in line with the development plan and material planning considerations.

Conditions

13. A condition specifying the relevant drawings is necessary as this provides certainty.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Evans

INSPECTOR