
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2017

by Daniel Hartley BA Hons MTP MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3163138

Rose Cottage, 11 Poplars Close, Ruislip HA4 7BU

- 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 Mark Kean against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 26242/APP/2016/2782, dated 18 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a part first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part first floor rear extension at Rose Cottage, 11 Poplars Close, Ruislip HA4 7BU in accordance with the terms of application Ref 26242/APP/2016/2782, dated 18 July 2016, subject to the attached schedule of conditions.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether or not the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site falls within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area (CA) and comprises a detached dwelling with white rendered walls located at the end of a cul-de-sac. It is orientated at an angle on the site and therefore the side elevation faces onto Poplars Close.
 4. This part of the CA is characterised by mainly two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings, although there is a single storey detached building adjacent to the appeal property (to the east) which is used as a nursery. The Ruislip Conservation Area Appraisal 2010 categorises the site as falling within "*Character Area 3 – West of the High Street*" and states that the area has a "*spacious, green and leafy appearance*" and that No 6 Poplars Close has a "*distinctive green pantiled roof*". The dwellings in Poplar Close are large and imposing and are mainly constructed from brick, although some do include elements of render. Most of the properties have hipped roofs and are set well back from Poplars Close behind large driveways and mature vegetation. The large properties vary in terms of size, but they are all set within large plots and there is a sense of space between and around the dwellings. These attributes add positively and distinctively to the character and appearance of the CA.
-

5. The dwelling has already been extended by means of a part single storey, part two storey side extension, a first floor side extension and front porch (planning permission Ref No 26242/APP/2003/1287). The proposed first floor extension would be positioned above the existing single storey kitchen (which currently has a high lean to roof) and would include the removal of a dormer window which currently functions as an en-suite associated with the first floor master bedroom. The proposal would create a larger en-suite and storage area associated with such a bedroom. To the side of the property the resultant roof would appear hipped and to the rear of the property the extension would have the effect of creating a valley roof where it joins existing and similar development.
6. The proposal would not be large in the context of the size of the existing house, particularly when the removal of the dormer is taken into account. I accept that the dwelling has already been extended, but cumulatively I do not consider that the extension would amount to a disproportionate, bulky or harmful addition to the house. The proposal is essentially a form of infill development, would have no effect upon the size of the garden and would have a very limited impact upon the sense of space between and around properties. Given the position of the proposed development, it would not be conspicuous when viewed from Poplars Close. In this sense, the property would continue to retain its original character and appearance when viewed from this public area.
7. I do not consider that the formation of a valley roof would harm the appearance of the rear of the dwelling. It would simply reflect the appearance of the existing two storey outrigger and would introduce an element of design consistency to the rear of the property. Furthermore, and, in any event, given the mature landscaping on the boundaries of the rear garden, and the separation distances from other surrounding properties, the development would not stand out or be prominent from private land.
8. In conclusion, whilst I acknowledge that the dwelling has already been extended, the proposal would essentially amount to a relatively small and subordinate first floor infill proposal (including the removal of existing development) and would have a pitched roof lower than the main roof of the house. It would have no impact upon the character and appearance of the dwelling when viewed from Poplars Close and would not be overly conspicuous or prominent when viewed from private land to the rear. Overall, the property would continue to retain a large garden and the original character, appearance and proportions of the house would remain intact when viewed from public areas. Furthermore, I do not disagree with the Council that the proposal would not cause material harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.
9. For the reasons outlined above, the proposal would have a neutral impact upon the design of the dwelling and would not be out of scale. It would not have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the street-scene and would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. Therefore, the proposal would accord with the conservation and design aims of Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies 2012; Policies BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies 2012; the adopted Supplementary Planning Document "Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS): Residential Extensions" 2009 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

10. The conditions set out in the accompanying schedule are based on those suggested by the Council. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three year time limit condition. It is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. I have therefore imposed a condition to this effect. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, it is necessary that that the development is built in materials to match the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal would accord with the development plan for the area. Therefore the appeal should be allowed.

Daniel Hartley

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.
- 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: Drawing P101; Drawing P201 and Drawing P202.
- 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.