
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2025 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/25/3369226

15 Manor Road, Ruislip, Hillingdon HA4 7LA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Leslie against the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 29504/APP/2025/313.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed, and planning permission is refused.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter & Main Issue

3. The Council has provided a supporting statement which provides a draft refusal reason they would have used should they have decided the application. Therefore, the main issue whether or not the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal building is a detached dwelling of a simple plan form which sits centrally within its plot. The wider locality has a mix of detached bungalows and two storey buildings. Residential streets in the area feature mature trees and set back dwellings in a scale, siting and density typical of the Metroland suburb. The appeal building's location and type, with its notable forward projecting gable and single span shallow hipped roof, is reflective of the area's garden suburb character. It sits, visually speaking, as a largely original example of its type and, consequently, contributes positively to the significance of the CA.
5. The appeal proposal would involve a significant side and rear extension which would wrap around and entirely subsume the existing building and harmfully erode its simple plan form. Moreover, the combination of different rooflines and asymmetry would result in awkward intersections, particularly at the rear, detracting from not only the gable feature on the front of the building but similar ones in the street. There would be some appearance of subservience from the front elevation, however, the overall combination of extensions would be large and clearly not

subordinate, dominating the building's original quality in scale and architectural terms.

6. Policy DMHD 1 details how alterations and extensions should relate to dwellings. Single storey extensions should not exceed 4m in depth, however, the proposal at single storey level exceeds this figure. Whilst the additional storey would meet this requirement, it would not result in an acceptable scheme overall. Resultantly, it would subsume the rear elevation and present an incongruous and large extension, leading to the above harmful effects. Whilst the render proposed would not be rough, subject to an appropriate coloured finish and the degree of variance in this respect locally, a smoother finish would not be harmful in and of itself.
7. Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing. Nationally speaking, paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) places emphasis on great weight being given to an asset's conservation. Given the above assessment, the proposal neither preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the CA. Due to the scale of the development in context, the harm is to the lower end of less than substantial. As directed by paragraph 215 of the Framework, this should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
8. The appellant has advised that the scheme would be potentially abandoned and that the property is in need of investment given its dilapidated state. To which I give limited weight as the building is currently being used as a residential property, and I am also not convinced there is not an alternative way to extend it and secure its longer term use. I have not been provided with any other public benefits.
9. It is sufficiently clear, given the above, that the public benefits would not outweigh the great weight given to the conservation of the CA. Therefore, there would be conflict with Policies HC1 and D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies 2012, Policies DMHB 4, DHMB 11 and DMD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies 2020 and the relevant paragraphs of the Framework. Together, these seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and conserve the historic environment, amongst other things.

Other Matters

10. The main parties have referred to Number 17 Manor Road as an example of a building which has been significantly extended. I have been provided with limited information around the planning history and resultantly I am unaware of the circumstances which prevailed at the time of granting that permission. Overall, I am not sufficiently convinced that there is a precedent which has been set which would lead me to recommend the appeal be allowed.
11. Concerns the appellant has with the Council during the handling and consideration of the appeal scheme prior to and during the planning application process are for the main parties to establish and resolve outside of appeal proceedings.
12. The appellant has raised that no article 4 direction has been put in place to restrict permitted development rights to the rear. Be this as it may, the scheme is not being considered under such a regime. Moreover, I have not been provided with any

legitimate permitted development scheme with which this scheme could be comparable.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would not comply with the development plan and I have been given no other compelling reason, taking into account other material considerations advanced, to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR