



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 October 2018

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 October 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/18/3206627

51 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 R Ahmed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 24650/APP/2018/1479, dated 23 April 2018, was refused by notice dated 22 June 2018.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear extension and extension to the roof to create additional habitable space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor extension and extension to the roof to create additional habitable space at 51 Ickenham Road Ruislip HA4 7BZ, in accordance with the application Ref : 24650/APP/2018/1479 dated 23 April 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:

All plans start with the prefix: 51ickenhamroad/2017/ except for 07 which uses the prefix 51ickenhamroad/2014

 - 01 Existing Ground Floor Plan
 - 02 Existing First and Loft Floor Plans
 - 03 Existing Elevations (Rev A)
 - 05 Proposed First and Loft Floor Plans (Rev B)
 - 06 Proposed Elevations (Rev B)
 - 07 Location Plan and Block Plan (Rev B)
 - 08 Existing and Proposed Roof Plans
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the host dwelling and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a large two storey dwelling located in a predominately residential area, and has been previously extended to the rear. The appeal proposal would be constructed above an existing rear single storey projection, and would include a crown roof which would allow additional living accommodation in that roof space.
4. I find that the design of the proposal would harmonise well with the existing dwelling, and would not be visible within the street scene. It would also respect the existing strong gable features on the rear elevation. I have noted the comments of the Council's Conservation and Urban Design Officer which stated that the central section should be flat roofed, rather than the crown roof proposed. I consider that the use of a flat roof would be harmful to the overall appearance of the dwelling, were it to be constructed, and that the use of a crown roof is more appropriate from a design perspective in this instance. The removal of the existing flat roof element present in the existing single storey extension with a bespoke designed first floor extension would lead to improvements in the overall appearance of the dwelling and as a result, I do not consider that the development would have a detrimental effect on the existing dwelling.
5. The appeal site lies within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area to the south-west of the medieval village core and High Street. This residential area was developed in the Garden Suburb tradition and the appeal property reflects its character of large detached houses standing in a mature garden setting. Given the design and form of the proposal, I find that the character of the Conservation Area would remain unharmed for the reasons given above.
6. I conclude that the proposal would not conflict with policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan : Part One – Strategic Policies (2012), policies BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan : Part Two – Saved UDP Policies (2012), policy 7.8 of the London Plan and the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document : Residential Extensions, which when taken as a whole, amongst other matters, expect proposals to include high quality design, harmonise with the existing building, complement the amenity and character of the area, and conserve and enhance Hillingdon's distinct and varied environment.

Other Matters

7. I am mindful of the objection raised by a local resident with regard to the sizing and location of the appeal proposal and the effect on the Conservation Area. I have taken this into consideration when assessing the relative merits of the proposal. For the reasons outlined above I am satisfied that the proposal would not give rise to any such adverse effects.

Conditions

8. It is necessary to impose the three year time limit and a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in the interests of certainty. Condition 3 is imposed to ensure that the character and appearance of the area is protected

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR