



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2021

by Rebecca McAndrew BA Hons, PG Dip Urban Design, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3270657

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/2021/59 dated 5 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 February 2021.
- The development proposed is described as 'first floor extension and extension to roof to create habitable space'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area, including the Ruislip Village Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area (CA). Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the character or appearance of the CA.
4. The gable features of the proposed extension would reflect the rear elevation of the existing property. The roof planes of those structures would be a similar pitch to the original roof of the dwelling. By comparison, the proposed crown roof element, between these gables would include an extremely steep pitch which would be at odds with the existing roof form. This pitch would be almost vertical, giving this part of the proposed extension a bulky appearance, which would fail to harmonise with the host dwelling.
5. I note the proposed extension would include materials to match the existing dwelling, but this would do little to reduce the visual impact of the proposed crown roof design detail. Whilst the proposed extension would not be visible within the street scene, and it would be a relatively small design feature, there would be views of this incongruous detail from neighbouring properties.

6. Planning consent for a similar extension to the host dwelling was allowed at appeal in 2018¹. However, the crown roof element of that scheme was significantly shallower than that of the current proposal and better reflected the existing roof pitch of the main house. The previous scheme would therefore have harmonised well with the appeal dwelling, unlike the development before me. I therefore attach limited weight to this matter in support of allowing the appeal.
7. The wider area includes properties with a variety of roof types. I have considered information submitted by the appellant in this respect and note that the context of those properties highlighted differs from the scheme before me. I recognise that another property on Ickenham Road includes a mansard roof with a similar pitch to the roof detail of the crown roof element of the appeal scheme. However, it appears that this roof form was constructed as part of the comprehensive design for a much larger building, rather than an extension to an existing single dwelling. I acknowledge that crown roofs are not uncommon within the area, however the pitch of those roofs referred to within the appellant's submission, including that of No 33a Ickenham Road, appear to be consistent with the overall roof pitches of each of the host dwellings. Notwithstanding, each proposal must be considered on its own merits. In view of the above, this matter only merits limited weight which does not lead me to a different view in this case.
8. Taking into account all the above matters, I conclude that the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA.
9. In the context of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the level of harm I have identified must be considered to be less than substantial. Paragraph 196 of the Framework states that where a development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset (such as the CA), this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
10. However, the limited public benefits associated with constructing a rear extension to this dwelling do not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character of the CA or the host building.
11. The appeal proposal would therefore be contrary to the requirements of Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020), Policy HC1 of the new London Plan (2021) and the provisions of the Framework. Taken together, these seek to secure high quality development which responds to the host dwelling and local context, including the preservation of the character and appearance of the CA.

Other matters

12. I note that, following the previous appeal decision, the appellant sought pre-application advice for a revised proposal and that the current scheme has been designed in response to negative advice given by the Council. However, given that I have found the appeal scheme would unacceptably harm the character

and appearance of the host dwelling and area, I attach limited weight to this matter in reaching my decision.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR