

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2021

**by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 24 February 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3259240**  
**15 Sharps Lane, Ruislip, HA4 7JG**

- 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 Mackay against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref 23160/APP/2020/2106, dated 8 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 August 2020.
  - The development proposed is alterations to main roof for loft conversion.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposed development is taken from the application form. The decision notice describes the proposed development as "Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 1 front rooflight."

### Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling of brick and tile construction, located within a residential area.
  5. The property is situated within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area, which in this location is characterised by the presence of an attractive range of properties from different periods, largely comprising two storey dwellings, including detached, semi-detached and terraced houses.
  6. During my site visit I observed that whilst many properties have been altered and/or extended, such changes tend to appear in keeping with the original character of host properties. Close to the appeal property, houses tend to be set back from the road behind low-brick boundaries, gardens and/or driveways and have relatively long gardens to the rear. This provides for a sense of spaciousness and greenery, providing a pleasant backdrop within which built features are easily observed.
-

7. Also during my site visit, I noted that the roofscape close to the appeal property generally appears in its original form, largely unbroken by the addition of dormers.
8. A box dormer to the rear roof slope is proposed. The appellants state that the proposed dormer has taken into consideration the issues raised in respect of a previously refused proposal.<sup>1</sup> Whether or not this is the case, the proposed dormer the subject of this appeal would appear as a rather large and bulky addition to the rear roof slope. As such, it would draw attention to itself as an alien feature, largely out of keeping with the roofscape of the immediate area.
9. Further, as a result of its size and positioning, the proposal would not appear as a subordinate addition to the host property, but would appear as dominant feature on the roof slope, drawing attention to itself as a prominent addition.
10. Consequently, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area, contrary to the Framework, to London Plan (2016) Policy 7.8, to Local Plan<sup>2</sup> Policies BE1 and HE1, and to Development Management<sup>3</sup> Policies DMHB1, DMHB4 and DMHB11, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

#### *Other Matters*

11. The appellants, in support of their case, draw attention to a dormer extension at No 19 Sharps Lane. However, that property is a large detached dwelling and appears so significantly different to the appeal property as not to provide for direct comparison.

#### **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

*N McGurk*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Reference: 23160/APP/2019/3333.

<sup>2</sup> Reference: Hillingdon Local Plan Part One – Strategic Policies (2012).

<sup>3</sup> Reference: Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020).