



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2022

**by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 14 February 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3282262**

**129 Evelyn Avenue, Ruislip HA4 8AH**

- 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 Mrs S Kukapalan against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
  - The application Ref 75930/APP/2021/1114, dated 19 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 June 2021.
  - The development proposed is single storey rear extension, single storey garage extension, first floor side/rear extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 7 rooflights with rendering to external walls and alterations to fenestration.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary Matter

2. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of the development has not changed. However, the wording from the Council's decision notice has been entered rather than that from the application form. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the Council's decision notice which more accurately describes the full extent of the proposals.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the street scene within Evelyn Avenue.

## Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey link detached dwelling on a street characterised by detached and link-detached properties. Although there is some variation in detailing and size, with several having been extended, the properties on this part of the south side of Evelyn Avenue are characterised by ridgelines running away from the street rather than parallel to it.
5. The three differing roof forms proposed would result in an overly complicated three-dimensional form with the juxtaposition of the flat roof element of the two-storey side extension resulting in an awkward arrangement with the larger roof structures.
6. The proposals would cumulatively result in significant bulk to the upper portions of the host dwelling. The alterations to the roof, with the narrow flat

roof element of the tallest roof running parallel to the road, and its bulk, would be at odds with the prevailing pattern of housing in this part of the street scene.

7. Overall, the combination of the scale of development, the detailing of its roof and subsequent change to the three-dimensional form of the dwelling with a dominant and contrived roof arrangement would jar injuriously with the other properties in this part of the street scene.
8. There is no harm from other aspects of the design including, amongst other things, the rear single storey extension and roof lights. However, these acceptable elements do not overcome my concerns in relation to how the proposal would be viewed in the street scene.
9. The adjacent property has approval for a large extension, however it is markedly different to the proposal before me, particularly in regard to its roof form. The circumstances in the adjacent approval are not therefore directly comparable to those before me.
10. I therefore find that the proposal would have a harmful effect on this part of the street scene within Evelyn Avenue. As such the proposal would conflict with the requirements of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020). These require, amongst other things, that all development, including extensions, alterations and new buildings will be required to be designed to the highest standards and, incorporate principles of good design including harmonising with the local context.

## **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

*Mr R Walker*

INSPECTOR