
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2017

by Siobhan Watson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 3 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3180945

2 The Ridgeway, Ruislip, HA4 8QS

- 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 Ockelford against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 72724/APP/2017/1134, dated 29 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension, first floor side extension and alterations to the main roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal house is situated in a street which is characterised by detached dwellings with similar roof heights. Houses vary in size and style, displaying a variety of roof forms. The existing dwelling has already been significantly extended so that it is noticeably larger than many of its neighbours.
4. The side and rear extensions would substantially increase the bulk of the building. Some space would be retained to either side of the house at first floor level but the new roof would be noticeably increased in height. The increase in height, when taken together with the increased width and bulk of the roof, would result in a dwelling that would be large and imposing in comparison with neighbouring dwellings. The resultant building would therefore appear incongruous and dominant within the street-scene.
5. I appreciate that the design would conform with many of the guidelines in the Supplementary Planning Document *Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement*, 2006 (HDAS) but the HDAS also indicates that proposals will be considered in terms of their setting within the overall street-scene. In this respect, I find conflict with the HDAS.
6. The appellant has made reference to a previous appeal decision¹ but the dwelling in that appeal was on a different road and of a different design to the

¹ APP/R5510/D/15/3140825

appeal house so I do not consider it to be directly comparable to the case before me. The appellant has also drawn my attention to an extension at 19 The Ridgeway. This house is of a different design to the appeal house and the existence of this extension does not justify further harm.

7. I therefore conclude that the proposed extensions would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, there would be conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012); Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012). In combination, these policies require that new development harmonises, complements or improves the character of an area. Furthermore, it would conflict with Paragraphs 17 and 19 the National Planning Policy Framework which says that planning should always seek to secure high quality design and that development should respond to local character.
8. I have had regard to all other matters raised but none outweigh the conclusions I have reached and the appeal is dismissed.

Siobhan Watson

INSPECTOR