
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2019

by R Norman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3232120
7A Manor Road, Ruislip HA4 7LA

- 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 & Mrs S Bains against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 69063/APP/2019/912, dated 10 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension to dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a roof extension to dwellinghouse at 7A Manor Road, Ruislip HA4 7LA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 69063/APP/2019/912, dated 10 March 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: Drawing Numbers 01A and 02A.
 - 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.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and whether it would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area; and
 - the effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling which was constructed as an infill property. It is subservient in scale to the nearby properties and has a driveway to the front and private garden to the rear.
4. The site is located within the Ruislip Village Conservation Area and the existing property is attractive and makes a positive contribution, assimilating well with the surrounding properties and street scene. The Conservation Area is set around the medieval core of the area and consists of a mix of residential and commercial properties with varied architectural details. Manor Road is in proximity to the commercial area along High Street and comprises linear rows of houses and bungalows with varied appearances.
5. Part of the proposed development would involve the conversion of the existing hip roof to a gable roof. This would involve extending the ridge to both sides. The properties directly adjacent to the appeal dwelling display gable ends and in the wider area there is variety in the roof styles. A common feature is the presence of front gables and the alteration to the roof would retain this common feature whilst replicating the roof line of neighbouring properties.
6. Whilst the alterations to the roof would, in effect, double the ridge width, given the variety of architectural styles along Manor Road, this would not look out of place or result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. Whilst it would increase the overall scale of the dwelling, this would not be excessive nor result in an over dominant property. The host property is subservient in scale to the adjoining properties, and although this contributes to the overall character along Manor Road, the squaring off of the roof and increase in scale would not detract from the visual characteristics of the area.
7. The proposed alterations to the existing roof would result in the reduction of the spacing between the appeal property and neighbouring properties either side. The existing dwelling allows for a sense of spaciousness between the properties and the dwelling itself is positioned close to the side boundaries of the site. However, the existing dwellings at Nos 7 and 9 are set away from the side boundaries at first floor level due to the existing single storey garages. Accordingly, whilst the space between the properties at first floor would be reduced, this would not be harmful in visual terms and would not unbalance the symmetry of the street or detract from the visual character.
8. The proposed development would also involve the addition of three rear dormers. These would be evenly spaced across the rear roof plane and would replicate the rear window design of the first floor of the existing property. I find that, as a result of the size of the property and the alterations to the roof style, the proposed dormers would sit comfortably within the roof and would not appear over dominant nor give the dwelling a top-heavy appearance. They would be reasonably well balanced by the window arrangements below and by the existing projecting single-storey rear extension.
9. A small gable feature is proposed to the front of the existing property to provide additional head room above the staircase. Although this feature would slightly overlap the existing main gable and add detail to the existing design of the front elevation, in the context of the main gable feature I find that this

- addition would complement the existing character of the front elevation and would not add clutter or unbalance the dwelling's appearance.
10. The existing property has two chimney stacks which project above the roof as a result of its hipped design. The alterations to the roof would largely obscure these features. Whilst they do complement the design of the property, the alterations to the visibility of the chimneys, in itself, would not be so harmful as to render the proposal unacceptable.
 11. Section 7 of the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions advises that roof extensions should appear secondary to the size of the roof face within which it would be set and provides guidance in terms of the required set in for dormer windows. However, whilst the proposed development would not comply wholly with the required set in distances, I find for the above reasons the scheme as a whole would not unduly harm the character and appearance of the host property and would preserve the character and appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area.
 12. Consequently, I acknowledge that the proposed development would alter the character and appearance of the original property, however for the above reasons I find that this would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the dwelling or the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. Accordingly, the proposal would comply with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012), Policies BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Saved UDP Policies (2012) (Local Plan Part Two) and Policy 7.8 of The London Plan (2016). These seek to achieve high quality design which harmonises with the existing street scene, the original building and the character of the area and conserves or enhances Conservation Areas, amongst other things.

Living Conditions

13. The appeal property is set within a row of existing dwellings, with Nos 7 and 9 flanking the appeal site. Both of these neighbouring properties have gable ends with a number of windows facing the appeal property.
14. The alteration to a gable roof would increase the ridge height over and above the existing hipped roof elements. It would square off the first floor and roof of the dwelling and, as a result, would bring the host property closer to the side gables of both adjoining properties.
15. I do not know the exact rooms that are served by the windows in the adjoining properties however some are fitted with clear glass so it would be reasonable to conclude that these serve some habitable rooms within the properties. I have had regard to the distances between the properties that would result from the proposed roof alterations and note that the outlook from these properties would change somewhat. However, due to the presence of the garage buildings, both Nos 7 and 9 are set away from the side boundaries of the appeal site. As a result, I find that sufficient space between the buildings would be retained to ensure that the change in outlook, sense of enclosure and light levels and overshadowing would not be to a harmful degree in both instances.
16. Accordingly, the proposal would comply with Policies BE19, BE20 and BE21 of the Local Plan Part Two which require development to safeguard and avoid

significant loss of residential amenity, including in terms of sunlight and daylight.

Conditions

17. In addition to the standard time limit condition I have included a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as this provides certainty. A condition for the materials used in the development to match the existing property is necessary in the interests of the visual character of the area and Conservation Area.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R Norman

INSPECTOR