



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2024

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9TH May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3338583

48 Myrtle Avenue, Ruislip, Hillingdon, HA4 8RZ

- 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 and Mrs Zakirov against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 77167/APP/2023/2854, dated 27 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2023.
- The development proposed is roof extension and loft conversion, 3 x roof lights to front elevation.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of roof extension and loft conversion, 3 x roof lights to front elevation at 48 Myrtle Avenue, Ruislip, Hillingdon, HA4 8RZ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 77167/APP/2023/2854, dated 27 September 2023 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: PA3-21118-00, PA3-21118-01, PA3-21118-02, PA3-21118-03, PA3-21118-04, PA3-21118-05, PA3-21118-06 and PA3-21118-07.
 - 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 issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 48 Myrtle Avenue is one of three detached bungalows in an established residential area, where there is a wide range of house types, most of which are two storey detached or semi detached houses with a variety of rooflines.
4. The policies relevant in this case include policies BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (November 2012) and DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management

policies (January 2020) (the local plan) and D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021). These relate to the design quality of new development, including extensions, which, among other things, should be sympathetic to the host building and harmonise with the local environment. Roof extensions should be located to the rear and subservient to the scale of the existing roof.

5. The proposal would amount to a remodelling of the bungalow. Although this would result in a marked alteration in its character and appearance, I consider that the scale, mass and bulk of the proposal would not be out of proportion in the context of the surroundings and the wide mix of house types and sizes along the street. The existing bungalow is the middle one of three in a row and although there are other bungalows along the street, the predominant overall pattern of development is of two storey houses.
6. The proposal would not be strictly in accordance with local plan policy DMHD1 which states that raising a main roof above the existing ridge line of a house will not generally be supported. In this case, the increase in height is required to accommodate new habitable space in a bungalow and would be relatively modest. The half hips at either end would reduce the overall bulk and reflect a feature found in a number of rooflines along the street. The front slope of the proposed new roof, with a similar pitch to the existing and roof lights, would present a relatively simple, unfussy appearance to the street scene. The existing symmetrical form of the frontage would remain and the projecting bay windows would appear more clearly expressed than they are at present.
7. I consider that the provision of additional living accommodation on the existing footprint would make good use of the land and that the increase in height and mass would not result in an adverse cumulative effect on the character and appearance of what is a varied street scene.
8. The rear dormers would be in proportion with the new roof form and set down from the new ridge and in from the sides and would include a large area of glazing. They would be visible in limited views from Warrender Park to the rear, but would be mainly screened by the high rear boundary fence and the trees and other vegetation in the Park especially when in leaf. They would appear in the context of several other prominent large rear dormers.
9. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the street scene or the wider area and that in this respect it is consistent with local plan policies BE1, DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1, and policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan.
10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

11. 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