

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2019

**by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 12 March 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/18/3217839**

**43 Sharps Lane, Ruislip, HA4 7JG**

- 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 Michael Lynch against the decision of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref 74067/APP/2018/2964, dated 17 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2018.
  - The development proposed is the installation of solid wall insulation.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of solid wall insulation at 43 Sharps Lane, Ruislip, HA4 7JG, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 74067/APP/2018/2964, dated 17 August 2018, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the specification submitted by the appellant's contractor dated 28 July 2018.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area (CA).

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling, which is situated in a residential street within the CA. The CA has a diverse character that includes the historic village centre, together with later residential areas, which are of a more suburban character and appearance. Sharps Lane falls within the suburban area and it mainly comprises detached and semi-detached dwellings of varying sizes and design, with traditional front and rear gardens. The extensive use of painted render and 'rough cast' is a notable characteristic.
4. Some of the dwellings on Sharps Lane are significant in terms of their design and appearance. However, whilst the appeal property has some distinguishing features, including a relatively wide overhang at eaves level, I am not persuaded that it is of any particular merit in heritage terms, notwithstanding the view of the Council.

5. The proposal is to install solid wall insulation, which (the appellant states) would be 90mm thick (including up to 10mm of white render). The appellant points to problems of mould and condensation, which he considers would be resolved by the installation of the proposed insulation. The Council argues that the proposal would be unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of the property and that it would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.
6. Of particular concern to the Council is the proposed insulation, which it considers would have an adverse effect on the architectural detailing of the building by reducing the depth of the overhang at eaves level; and by adding to the depths of returns, or by creating returns where none currently exist around the windows and doors. The Council also states that there are other potential solutions to the issues of mould and condensation.
7. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the provisions of the adopted Development Plan and the Council's associated guidance. Of particular relevance are Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1; Policies BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2; and Policy 7.8 of the London Plan. These policies generally seek to ensure (amongst other things) that new development is of high quality design that complements and enhances the area and the original building; and preserves or enhances conservation areas. I consider that the policies accord with the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (the Framework), which contains similar provisions.
8. I acknowledge that the installation of the render would have some effect on the appearance of the existing dwelling. In particular, the depth of the overhang at eaves level would be reduced and returns/reveals would be created around the windows. However, in my opinion, these changes would not be unduly significant or harmful to the overall appearance of the dwelling and they would have a neutral effect on the character or appearance of the CA. Accordingly, I consider that the proposal would not conflict with the provisions of the Development Plan or with the Framework, as referred to above.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to examples of insulation that has been installed at two nearby dwellings i.e. numbers 35 and 58 Sharps Lane. Although both of these houses are of a different external style to that of the appeal property, I consider that the installation of insulation on these dwellings has had little visual impact on the properties and neither has it been harmful to the character or appearance of the CA. Having said that, I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.

### **Conditions**

10. The Council has suggested conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed. These have been considered in the light of the advice contained within the Planning Practice Guidance.
11. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans has been suggested by the Council, but no plans have been submitted. However, the appellant has submitted a specification for the insulation as part of the appeal. I have included reference to this specification as a condition, in order to ensure a satisfactory external appearance.

## **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal should be allowed.

*Ian McHugh*

INSPECTOR