



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 May 2024

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3341814

316 Field End Road, Ruislip, Hillingdon, HA9 9PA

- 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 Vivek Kumar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 6942/APP/2024/127, dated 18 January 2024, was refused by notice dated 6 March 2024.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension and porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of single storey side extension and porch at 316 Field End Road, Ruislip, Hillingdon, HA99PA, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref. 6942/APP/2024/127, dated 18 January 2024 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan, RDK/HA/1329/DWG-01, RDK/HA/1329/DWG-02, RDK/HA/1329/DWG-03, RDK/HA/1329/DWG-04, RDK/HA/1329/DWG-05, RDK/HA/1329/DWG-06 and RDK/HA/1329/DWG-07.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issues in this case are its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 316 Field End Road is one of a pair of two storey semi-detached houses in a short row of three pairs of semi-detached houses set back from the main road on a slip road. The surrounding area is very mixed, with a car showroom and large three- and four-storey blocks opposite, a range of three-storey residential properties to the north and a variety of two-storey houses to the south.

4. The relevant policies in this case include BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (November 2012), DMHB11 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (January 2020) (the local plan) and D3 of the London Plan (2021). These relate to the design of new development and its impact on the public realm. Extensions should harmonise with the local environment and respect the design of the original house.
5. The Council raises no objection to the proposed front porch and I see no reason to disagree with this view.
6. The proposed single storey side extension would be set slightly back from the front elevation of the existing house and run the full length of the side elevation of the house and project into the rear garden along the side boundary with the neighbouring property, No. 318. I consider that it would not be an incongruous or excessive form of development since it would be relatively narrow and would replace an existing structure attached to the side of the house and an outbuilding to the rear adjacent to the garage at No. 318. It would be constructed in brick and replace some elements which at present do not make a positive contribution to the street scene.
7. Planning permission was granted in 2018 for a single storey side and rear extension, including the demolition of the existing outbuilding. The side element was similar to the present proposal in both width and depth and there was also a full width rear element approximately 4m deep. The removal of the full width rear element represents a significant reduction in size compared with the earlier scheme.
8. The Council refers to an Article 4 Direction relating to alterations and extensions to dwellings. The proposal would result in the extension into the rear garden beyond the recommendation in the Direction, but in this instance, the extension would replace an outbuilding and is similar to part of a scheme previously considered by the Council to be acceptable.
9. The proposal would be constructed of materials to harmonise with those of the original house and would appear subordinate to it. The rear element would not be visible from the street.
10. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the existing house or the surrounding area and that it is consistent with local plan policies BE1, DMHB11 and DMHD1, and policy D3 of the London Plan.
11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework. A condition detailing the plans is necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt. A condition relating to the materials is necessary in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR