



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2017

by Gwyn Clark BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 25 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3172956 2 Sharps Lane, Ruislip HA4 7JQ

- 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 Mathew Kybert against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 12519/APP/2016/3412, dated 13 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension and another two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for a single storey rear extension and another two storey side extension at 2 Sharps Lane, Ruislip HA4 7JQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 12519/APP/2016/3412, dated 13 September 2016, 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 drawing Nos 16/3017/3 and 16/3017/4.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing dwelling.

Main Issues

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the original dwelling and whether it would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. No 2 Sharps Lane lies near to the junction of Sharps Lane with Bury Street, close to the centre of the village and lying at the heart of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. This junction is dominated on one side by The George Public House and its associated car park and on the other side of the road lie 'Rosebank Villas', a group of three traditionally designed cottages (though No 1

appears subdivided into two separate dwellings). This group of houses is specifically recognised in the Ruislip Village Conservation Area Design Appraisal for their significance to the Village Centre element of the Conservation Area. They serve to terminate a 'Key Local View' taken from where Bury Street and High Street meet.

4. 'Rosebank Villas' are also important because they establish a distinctive architectural style which is then repeated further along Sharps Lane. The next property along Sharps Lane is No 2, the appeal property which is one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings. Beyond this pair lies a row of terraced cottages all designed in the same distinctive Victorian style.
5. The side elevation No 2 facing Rosebank Villas also makes an important contribution to the general character of the area. This is due to the way in which No 2 is set forward along Sharps Lane and the relatively large gap between the houses. Four windows, two at first floor and two below would be inserted into the existing side elevation. The two-story rear extension, replacing an existing 'outrigger', would be around 4m deep and 1.1m wider than the existing house. It would have a hipped roof that would tie into the main house roof.
6. The Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Extensions' stipulates a maximum 3.3m depth of a rear extension. This is to ensure that the extension remains subordinate to the original house. The dwelling is of a sufficiently robustly design and scale to accommodate an extension that is slightly deeper than advised and also one that is slightly wider than the original house. It would appear a subservient element particularly as the hipped roof of the extension would be much lower in height the extension. The insertion of narrow windows in the side elevation repeats a feature found on No 1 Bury Road and this would serve to enhance the character of this prominent side elevation.
7. In my opinion the extension respects the integrity and character of the design of the original house and is of high quality. It would also prove to be in harmony with the appearance of the street scene in general I find that it therefore meets the requirement of policies BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan Saved policies (UDPS). It would also comply with policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies, by maintaining and improving the quality of the built environment.
8. The house currently makes an important contribution to the character of the street scene and to the wider Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The Ruislip Village Conservation Area Appraisal describes the curving nature of Sharps Lane and describes how along it are found some of the earliest surviving Victorian workers' cottages. I consider that the extension would enhance the appearance of the original dwelling and make a positive contribution to the street scene. The 'Key Local View' of Sharps Lane would not be changed. It would consequently meet the test of policy BE4 of the UDPS and overall would serve to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
9. On other matters I agree with the Councils assessment that there may be some overshadowing the neighbour's garden but this would not prove

significant. I do not consider there would be a significant loss of light or privacy to neighbours on Bury Road due to the distance separating the houses.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard 3 year time limitation for commencement I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans. I have also imposed a condition requiring matching materials to be used, in the interest of the appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. Accordingly I allow the appeal and grant planning permission.

Gwyn Clark

INSPECTOR