



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 June 2019

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/19/3225709

9 Ickenham Road, Ruislip HA4 7BT

- 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 Alan Reeves against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 70106/APP/2019/94, dated 9 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension to existing shop and creation of first floor to create a studio flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension to existing shop and creation of first floor to create a studio flat at 9 Ickenham Road, Ruislip HA4 7BT, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 70106/APP/2019/94, dated 9 January 2019, 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: Site Location Plan and drawing numbers VSA18/12-001; VSA18/12-002; VSA18/12-003A; VSA18/12-004C.
 - 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.
 - 4) Before the development hereby approved is commenced, details of screening for the refuse bins shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved screening shall be in place prior to the occupation of the property and retained in perpetuity.
 - 5) Before the development hereby approved is commenced, details of sound proofing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall thereafter take place in accordance with the approved details and the sound proofing measures shall be in place prior to the occupation of the property and retained in perpetuity.
 - 6) Before the development hereby approved is commenced, details of covered and secure cycle storage shall be submitted to and approved in

writing by the local planning authority. The approved details shall be in place prior to the occupation of the property and retained in perpetuity.

- 7) Before the development hereby approved is commenced, details of means of enclosure shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Preliminary Matter

2. For the sake of clarity I have used the description of development from the Council's decision notice.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area and whether the proposed flat would provide satisfactory living conditions for its future occupiers.

Reasons

Conservation Area

4. The appeal site is an end of terrace property which sits within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area (RVCA).
5. In accordance with the duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. Moreover, paragraph 193 of the Framework states that when considering the impact of new development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
6. The RVCA immediately surrounding the appeal site is characterised primarily by a mixture of commercial and residential properties. There is a wide variation in the style, design and architectural detailing of the buildings within the area. In my view the significance of the RVCA in the area surrounding the appeal site is derived from the variant architectural character and design of the buildings.
7. The existing building is reflective of the variety of building forms in the area. The building is unassuming when viewed within the wider street scene, being modest in scale compared to the large two storey properties adjacent to the site. Whilst the building appears to be of a similar age to the other properties on Ickenham Road, I consider the existing building to have a neutral effect which preserves the character and appearance of the RVCA.
8. The proposal would be in keeping with the variant design and styles of the surrounding area. The proposed first floor addition and pitched roofs would reflect the architectural styles of the adjacent properties which would add to its character and would not detract from the appearance of the area.
9. The two storey staggered flat roof rear extension would be out of character with the design details of the existing parade of shops in the area. However, this part of the scheme is located to the rear of the property and would not be visible within the main street scene. This rear extension would not be overly

large and would not dominate the appeal building as a whole and would not be an intrusive feature within the RVCA.

10. The proposal would be subordinate in terms of its scale and relationship with the existing properties on Ickenham Road and would not harmfully alter the character of the existing parade of shops. The development would result in the loss of symmetry with the single storey building opposite however, I do not consider the relationship with this building opposite to be significant.
11. I acknowledge the points made by the Council and the Ruislip Conservation Panel, however for the reasons given above, I find that the design characteristics and local vernacular of the RVCA would not be unduly harmed by the proposed development.
12. I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the RVCA. The proposal would not be contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies 2012 (HLP1), Policies BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies 2012 (HLP2), Policy 7.8 of the London Plan 2016 (LP), the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Documents – Residential Layouts 2006 (SPDRL) and Residential Extensions 2008 (SPDRE) and the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks new development to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment and conserve and enhance designated heritage assets such as Conservation Areas.
13. I have had regard to the Council's Planning Officer Report including two refused applications (refs: 70106/APP/2014/4054 & 70106/APP/2014/2322), one of which was subsequently dismissed at appeal. However, I do not consider that these schemes represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal, including in respect of scale and design. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.

Living conditions

14. The proposal is for a one bedroom studio flat which includes a toilet and shower room. The Council considers the proposed flat to have a gross internal floor area of 32 square metres (sqm) whereas the appellant considers the proposed floor area to be 39 sqm.
15. The Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS), which have been adopted through the LP, state that for a one bedroom dwelling with a shower room that can accommodate one person the minimum floor space should be 37 sqm. There is an obvious disagreement between the parties in terms of the floor space however it is noted that the Council have excluded the staircase in their calculations. This may account for the difference in the floor space figures. Policy 3.5 of the LP does not indicate whether the staircase floor space of a proposal should be included within the gross internal floor area or not. My attention has not been brought to any other evidence which would confirm this either.
16. From the evidence before me, I consider that the proposal would offer adequately sized rooms with efficient room layouts providing a spacious environment for one person. The proposal provides living accommodation which would be functional and fit for purpose with sufficient space to satisfactorily meet the day to day needs of its future occupants.

17. I note that the proposed scheme does not provide any private amenity space. The SPDRL does state that there are exceptions to garden area requirements, and this includes small non-family housing, predominantly made up of one bedroom units, in town centres or the provision of small non-family housing above shops. Given the size of the proposed flat and its location with regards to commercial properties, I do not consider that the lack of amenity space provision would have a detrimental effect on the living conditions of future occupiers.
18. From the evidence before me, I am unable to determine the exact size of the proposed floor space of the flat. Therefore, there may be a breach of the requirement of Table 3.3 of the LP. Nevertheless, for the reasons above, I conclude that there would be no material harm to the living conditions of future occupiers of the proposed flat. The proposal would comply with Policy 3.5 of the LP and the SPDRL which seek new homes to have adequately sized rooms and convenient and efficient room layouts which are functional and fit for purpose.

Conditions

19. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition relating to materials in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area.
20. The Council have suggested four pre-commencement conditions. These relate to the submission of details of screening for refuse bins, sound proofing, cycle storage and means of enclosure. The appellant has agreed to these conditions.
21. Details of refuse bins screening and means of enclosure are necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. Sound proofing details are required in the interest of protecting the living conditions of future occupiers of the flat with details of cycle provision necessary to encourage sustainable forms of transport.

Conclusion

22. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal should be allowed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR