



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 June 2023

by **Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/23/3320787

37 Windmill Hill, Ruislip, Hillingdon HA4 8PY

- 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 Chris Demeester against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 21828/APP/2022/3769 dated 12 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2023.
- The development proposed is described as erection of a first floor rear extension and single storey rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a first floor rear extension and single storey rear extension at 37 Windmill Hill, Ruislip, Hillingdon HA4 8PY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21828/APP/2022/3769 dated 12 December 2022, and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matters

2. At the time of my site visit, the development was complete. The application made clear that the scheme was submitted retrospectively, and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of existing property and area in general.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The site is a detached property within a predominantly residential area with Ruislip Manor Town Centre to south. Properties in the immediate area vary in terms of design.
5. I understand there is a previous approval¹ for a similar development, the main difference between the approved scheme and the development before me are the roof designs. The revised roof design includes a glazed infill roof above the single storey rear extension and alteration from the approved hipped main roof to the rear to part gable/part hipped.

¹ 21828/APP/2021/13

6. The infill glazed mono pitched roof is unobtrusive in terms of scale and design adding interest to the rear of the property.
7. The material proposed on the submitted drawing differ from that of the as built development, the first floor has been fully rough rendered in a sandstone colour which is not a common colour found in the immediate area, nonetheless I understand this is similar to the materials used on the rear of the appeal property prior to the development. Should the materials noted on the submitted plan be used, for instance hanging tiles, I do not find that this would significantly affect the visual appearance of the property which would warrant refusal.
8. The windows located in the first floor rear elevation are below the eaves of the roof, nevertheless they do not exacerbate the mass of the development. I find that the development is not disproportionate in scale to the appeal site. Whilst I did not observe a similar roof design to that of the development it did not appear incongruous to the existing property or area in general.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the existing property and area in general. There is no conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon's A Vision for 2026, Local Plan: Part 1, Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 the Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020), Policy D3 the London Plan (2021) which amongst other things seek to ensure developments are of high quality design which respect the design of the original property and surrounding area.
10. There is no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) which seeks amongst other things to ensure developments are of good design which adds to the overall quality of an area.

Conclusion

11. The Council consider conditions relating to implementation of the permission, plans to be adhered and materials to be used should be imposed, however these are not relevant or necessary as the development is complete.
12. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR