
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2017

by Michael Moffoot DipTP MRTPI DipMgt MCMI

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

Decision date: 8th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/16/3162361
30 Midcroft, Ruislip HA4 8ES

- 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 Don Berry against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 27043/APP/2016/3044, dated 9 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single-storey side extension at 30 Midcroft, Ruislip HA4 8ES in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 27043/APP/2016/3044, dated 9 August 2016, and 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: (i) 1:1250 site location plan; and (ii) drawing no. 02 Rev A.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, including the Midcroft Area of Special Local Character (ASLC).

Reasons

3. This part of Ruislip is characterised by established family housing set on generous plots enhanced by mature landscaping. Here, the ASLC designation recognises that the area possesses sufficient architectural, townscape and environmental quality to make it of considerable local value, where the Council seeks to protect and enhance the special character of the area and resist inappropriate development.
-

4. The appeal site is located close to the junction of Midcroft and North Drive and comprises a semi-detached dwelling with a conservatory to the rear, a two-storey extension and car-port to the side and a small open porch to the front. The car-port and part of the existing integral garage would be demolished to accommodate the proposed single-storey extension, which would align with the full-height bay on the front elevation of the dwelling and wrap around the side of the building. The extension would incorporate a hipped roof with a return that would give way to a flat roof towards the rear.
5. The Supplementary Planning Document: *Residential Extensions*¹ (SPD) includes detailed guidance for front and side extensions to dwellings. In order to appear subordinate it states that the width and height of an extension should be considerably less than that of the main house and between half and two-thirds of the original house width, depending on the plot size and character of the area. The appeal proposal would breach the width guideline. However, the existing car-port is a sizeable addition, extending from the corner of the original dwelling almost to the side boundary of the property and for most of its depth. Although higher than the car-port, the proposed extension would be markedly narrower, and would be considerably lower in height than the main house.
6. The extension would slightly exceed the maximum height for single-storey side extensions advocated in the SPD and, in conjunction with the existing porch, would extend across the entire main frontage of the dwelling. In such circumstances the SPD advises that permission will normally be refused. However, the dwelling occupies a sizeable plot and the building is set well back from the road and partly screened by a dense, mature hedge to the front boundary. As such, the scale, height and width of the proposed extension would not render it excessive or intrusive when viewed from the street and it would be visually subordinate to the main dwelling. Furthermore, the design of the proposal would respect the character of the existing property, including the full height bay to the front, and the adjoining dwelling. The proposal would integrate satisfactorily with its surroundings where a wide variety of residential extensions is evident.
7. Reference is also made to the loss of symmetry of No 30 and the attached dwelling as a result of the proposal. However, the symmetry has already been compromised by the two-storey extension and car-port to the appeal property such that it is no longer a defining feature of the pair. No harm would therefore arise in this respect.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not materially harm the character and appearance of the area, including the Midcroft ASLC. It would not conflict with those parts of Policies HE1 and BE1 of Part 1 of the Local Plan² which seek high quality design that enhances the local distinctiveness of the area, contributes to a sense of place and conserves and enhances the Borough's distinct and varied environment, including ASLCs. Similarly, the proposal would not breach saved policies BE5, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Local Plan (Part 2)³ which, amongst other things, require the

¹ *Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions* (2008)

² *Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1-Strategic Policies* (2012)

³ *Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Saved UDP Policies* (2012)

design, style, height and symmetry of new development to harmonise with ASLCs, and also harmonise with the existing building and street scene in order to complement or improve the amenity and character of the area.

Conditions and Conclusion

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I shall require the use of matching materials in the interests of visual amenity. I shall also impose a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty.
10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposal is acceptable and the appeal should succeed.

Michael Moffoot

Inspector