
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2021

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3262668
33A Ickenham Road, Ruislip HA4 7BZ

- 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 Rattan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 16501/APP/2020/2497, dated 27 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear part single, part double storey extensions with hipped roof extended over with crown roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a rear part single, part double storey extensions with hipped roof extended over with crown roof at 33A Ickenham Road, Ruislip HA4 7BZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16501/APP/2020/2497, dated 27 August 2020, 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: Location Plan (1:1250); 2020-Ickenham-P2-01; 2020-Ickenham-P2-02; 2020-Ickenham-P2-03; 2020-Ickenham-P2-04; 2020-Ickenham-P2-05;.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces 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 / samples.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area (RVCA).

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this detached 2 storey house, said to date from the middle of the last century. The appeal site sits within the RVCA which contains detached residential properties, influenced by the Arts and Crafts Movement,

within a garden suburb style. The houses in the immediate vicinity are detached and sit within mature gardens.

4. The Council indicate that they do not object to the single storey extension but it is the size and roof design of the rear first floor extension that generates the refusal. Although the first-floor extension would be quite wide, it would be set in from either side of the existing house. It would have a hipped roof which would culminate in a crown, with an area of flat roof.
5. When seen against the existing house, I consider that the proposal would represent an appropriately sized addition which would neither dominate nor detract from the existing house. The proposal would be barely seen from the road, and from the neighbouring gardens, it would appear appropriately scaled in comparison with other properties that have obviously been extended also. The crown roof would not be prominent and taking account of its limited size, I do not consider that it could be described as large. I have taken account of other crown roofs within the RVCA, some very close to the appeal site and some more obvious in public views than the appeal scheme would be. In this respect, I consider that the proposal would not be harmful.
6. Overall, I consider that the proposal would harmonise with the existing building and would preserve the character and appearance of the RVCA. Therefore, the proposal is consistent with the requirements of Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020).
7. In relation to conditions, I shall impose the standard time-limit for the commencement of development, as well as one requiring that the development be undertaken in accordance with the approved drawings, for the sake of certainty. So that the proposed extension has an acceptable appearance, I shall impose a condition relating to the external materials.

Conclusions

8. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR