



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 September 2021

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3278178

40 Thurlstone Road, Ruislip HA4 0BT

- 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 Aleksandra & Dominik Maslach against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 71259/APP/2021/740, dated 24 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2021.
- The development proposed is Double Storey Side Infill Extension, Part Double Storey Part Single Storey Rear Extension, Loft Conversion, with insertion of rooflights, Render finish, to original house to match proposed extensions.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the time the appeal was submitted, the Council has approved a scheme for an extension to the appeal property.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

4. The character of the street scene along Thurlstone Road contains some variety to the house types, although they are in the main, arranged in planned blocks. It is also obvious that some end of row houses have been subdivided into further separate residential units.
5. The appeal property is the end dwelling within a row of approximately four houses. Number 34 at the other end of the row is also the same house type and shares the same roof formation above with a staggered ridgeline an original feature of the row.
6. The proposed roof would add considerable mass and bulk to the dwelling and would be highly visible from both the front and side elevations within the street scene. It would not be viewed as subordinate to the host dwelling due to the continuous ridge line that would be created across the dwelling.

7. The proposal would not relate well in design terms to the host dwelling and harmfully imbalance the symmetry that is a feature of this short row of houses given the corresponding roof of No 34. Consequentially, it would not represent high quality design and instead appear as a visually obtrusive form of development to the host dwelling, the row, and detrimentally harmful to the character and appearance of the wider street scene.
8. As a material consideration, I have taken into account the recently approved extension granted by the Council to the appeal property. This is a fallback position that the appellants can implement and there is a real prospect of these works being undertaken given it has been granted permission. However, there is a marked difference in the two schemes. This is notably to the roof configuration by the retention of the intrinsic step in ridge line which is a positive contribution to the host dwelling, the row of houses and to the local street scene. Overall, the two schemes cannot be reasonably compared, and I apply limited weight to the fallback position.
9. Comparisons in creating a similar roof type to Number 42 cannot be compared favourably given the block to which it is associated consists of a different house type, with its own specific characteristics.
10. I have had due regard to the property of No 8 Thurlstone Road. There may be no step to the ridge line of the roof of this dwelling. This dwelling and that of the appeal site are not sufficiently close in terms of physical relationship with one another to have an influence on the character and appearance of the street scene, or to my overall decision. Furthermore, the precise details of its circumstances are not before me to comment upon.
11. The extension at No 50 Thurlstone Road is not the same proposal as that before me to reasonably compare circumstances. The dwellings of 21A and 23A are different house types to that of the appeal property and cannot be compared. Neither is the example of a hip to gable extension that has been brought to my attention.
12. Numbers 13A and 15A (not No's 15 and 17 as listed within the Statement of Case) sit adjacent to one another and therefore the corresponding roof types appear harmonious in this particular situation.
13. Even though there may have been no letters of objection received to the proposal, this is a neutral matter that weighs neither for nor against the proposal. The appellants may favour this type of extension as opposed to a box dormer. However, that is a personal choice, and I cannot offer comment on the matter.
14. To conclude, the proposal would result in an uncharacteristic and visually obtrusive development, in particular by virtue of the roof formation and would lead to harm arising to the host dwelling, to the character and appearance of the row of houses, and to the local area. This would be in conflict with the design aims of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies 2012, Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies 2020.

Conclusion

15. As the proposal would result in harm arising to the character and appearance of the local area, it would thus lead to conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR