



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2022

by **Rebecca Thomas MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3286839

1 Bury Avenue, Ruislip HA4 7RT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs D Riggal against the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 24235/APP/2021/2038, dated 9 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 August 2021.
- The development proposed part single storey, part two storey side/rear extension (including extension over existing front garage), alterations to roof of existing two storey side element and conversion of roofspace into habitable use to include a rear dormer.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and permission is granted for to part single storey, part two storey side/rear extension (including extension over existing front garage), alterations to roof of existing two storey side element and conversion of roofspace into habitable use to include a rear dormer at 1 Bury Avenue, Ruislip in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 24235/APP/2021/2038, dated 9 May 2021, 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:01A (Existing Plans and Elevations) and 02A (Proposed Plans and Elevations).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed from that stated on the planning form. Notwithstanding this, I have used the description as used on the Council's decision notice as this more accurately describes the proposal as shown on the plans and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. I consider that the main issue is the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located in a residential area where houses tend to be detached and set back from the road, with parking and garden spaces to frontages. I noted at my site visit the variation of type and appearance of dwellings, including gable features, bay windows, tiled mansard style roofs, timber detailing and varying types of alterations. Dwellings are not uniform, creating individual characteristics set in a quiet neighbourhood.
5. The site is a two storey detached dwelling with a hipped roof, and a single storey garage to the side and a single storey rear extension. The dwelling is similar in character and appearance to its neighbour at no. 3 Bury Avenue, however contrasts with the other neighbouring property at no. 1a, which is a more recent dwelling orientated with its gable forming the side elevations.
6. The proposed two storey development would introduce a first floor to the side of the garage with the first floor set back from the existing main front elevation, including a canopied element and front access to the garage area to the ground floor. The side extension would provide an additional bedroom to the first floor, and introduce an extension of the roof including a double dormer window element to the rear elevation, making use of a 'crown roof' addition. The resultant development would have varied ridgelines, with the height and form of the original hipped roof being retained, and the new elements, lower than and being set back from the front elevation.
7. Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan¹ ("the Local Plan") sets out criteria for alterations and extensions to dwellings. Policy DHMB 11 of the Local Plan and BE 1 of the Local Plan Part 1². The development takes advantage of the existing footprint of the building and would remain set back from the frontage of the building and would not exceed the original height. The proposed extensions to the side of the dwelling would be apparent as seen from Bury Avenue, however the rear extensions and dormer windows would not be easily visible from the street. In addition to this, I was able to see that there have been other alterations to dwellings along the street and within the wider locality, and as such do not consider that the proposed development would unduly dominate or be at odds with the overall character and appearance of the host dwelling or the local area.
8. Policy DMHD 1 sets out a requirement that roof extensions should not create a dominant 'top heavy' appearance out of proportion with the rest of the building. Whilst the extensions proposed are sizeable, the design takes cues from the existing dwelling and respect the original dwelling and the existing hipped roof would remain largely apparent as seen from the street. The crown roof extension would allow the original building to retain its character and appearance, whilst enabling the extension of the property.
9. The dormer window would be located to the rear, would be subservient to the scale of the existing roof and would be located below the ridge tiles of the original roof, and retain a substantial element of the original roof slope above the eaves line. Whilst the Council has concerns that the proposed dormer window would be larger than two thirds of the average width of the original roof, I have also taken into account that the proposed development would

¹ London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2: Development Management Policies (January 2020)

² Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (November 2012)

include the extension of the roof, thus extending the average width of the roof. The dormer window would appear proportionate to the roof slope as set out in the plans before me. Therefore, the proposed extensions would comply with the requirements of Policy DMHD 1.

10. The proposed materials are to match that of the existing, and this, together with the other considerations lead me to conclude that there would be no harm to the character or the streetscene as a result of the proposed development. As such there would be conflict with Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 11 and BE1 of the Local Plan and Local Plan Part 1 which expect, among other things, new development to provide high quality design which harmonises with the local context and be well integrated with the surrounding area. I consider that these policies are consistent with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and can therefore be given substantial weight.

Other Matters

11. There are concerns over construction methods, working hours, noise, storage and parking however these are not matters that are material to the planning considerations of the proposal. Any noise and disturbance associated with construction would be for a temporary period only. I did not see any parking restrictions in Bury Avenue, nor would the appeal site lose any of its existing parking. I consider it would not be reasonable to withhold consent on this basis alone.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard timescale for implementation condition, it is necessary to attach a condition to confirm the approved drawings in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition to ensure that the external surfaces materials would match the existing.

Conclusion

13. I have found that there is no harm to the character and appearance of the local area. I therefore conclude that, subject to the above conditions, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be allowed.

Rebecca Thomas

INSPECTOR