



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2018

by L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st February 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/17/3185207
88 Park Avenue, Ruislip HA4 7UP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 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 & Mrs Porter against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 72781/APP/2017/2464 is dated 7 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension and conversion of existing roof to gable ended.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey rear extension and conversion of existing roof to gable ended at 88 Park Avenue, Ruislip HA4 7UP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 72781/APP/2017/2464 dated 7 July 2017, 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 approved plans: Existing Ground Floor Layout Dwg No 16/024/01, Existing First Floor Layout Dwg No 16/024/02, Proposed Ground Floor Layout Dwg No 16/024/03D, Proposed First Floor Layout Dwg No 16/024/04B, Existing Elevations and Roof Plan Dwg No 16/024/05, Proposed Section A-A, Roof Plan, Side and Rear Elevations Dwg No 16/024/06I, Existing Section Dwg No 16/024/07, Proposed Section A-A Dwg No 16/024/08D, Proposed Loft Layout Dwg No 16/024/09B, Site Location Plan Dwg No 16/024/10 and Existing and Proposed Street Scene Dwg No 16/024/11
 - 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.

Procedural Matters and Main Issue

2. Amended plans were submitted whilst the Council was considering the planning application. However, I am not aware of the extent of any consultation on those plans such that if I were to consider them I would not be satisfied interested parties would not be prejudiced. Thus I have determined the appeal on the basis of the original plans submitted with the planning application.

3. The Council resolved that had it been in a position to determine the application, it would have refused planning permission for reasons relating to the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area. Thus the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling in residential area characterised by mainly detached properties set a similar distance back from the road with space between the buildings. The properties in the area are of a variety styles with both pitched and hipped roofs. Thus, the area has a formal and varied character and appearance.
5. The proposed two storey rear extension would not be widely visible from anywhere other than the appeal site. It would be proportionate to and in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling. The proposed dormer window would be viewed in the context of numerous other dormer windows nearby and would only take up a small proportion of the rear roof slope.
6. The proposed main roof conversion to a pitched roof would be viewed in a street scene which has a variety of roof forms including pitched roofs and gable ends and dormer windows, such that it would not look out of place. Although taller the proposed main roof would slope away from the road lessening its impact and would be a similar height to both immediate neighbouring properties. Moreover, sitting on a relatively large dwelling it would not appear disproportionate. Whilst the proposed gable facing the road would be wider than the bay window, its ridge would be lower than the main roof ridge and would be much narrower.
7. For these reasons the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would accord with saved Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (1998) (UDP), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) (LPP1) and the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement: Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2008) (HDAS). These policies, taken together, seek to ensure good design and that new development makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of an area.

Conditions

8. The conditions imposed are those which have been suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring the materials to match the existing dwelling in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, the proposed extensions would accord with the development plan and therefore the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted.

L Fleming

INSPECTOR