
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2019

by Laura Renaudon LLM LARTPI Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/19/3233264
2 & 4 South Park Way, Ruislip HA4 6UL

- 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 Dhanak, Mr Riedl and Ms Tsang against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 74298/APP/2018/3899, dated 11 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is the part two storey, part single storey side, rear extension and loft conversion including roof light to front slope at No 4 South Park Way and part two storey, part single storey side and part rear extension at No 2 South Park Way.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposed development was amended by the Council to refer to the part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension to No. 2 and part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a rear dormer and 2 front rooflights to No. 4.
3. The Council refused permission for several reasons including that, in its view, an appropriate flood risk assessment demonstrating the safety of the site had not been provided. Subsequently the Council has confirmed that an FRA submitted by the appellants overcomes this concern.

Main Issue

4. Accordingly, the main issues for consideration in the appeal relate to the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street scene and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site consists of two semi-detached properties standing at the corner of South Park Way and Great Central Avenue in Ruislip. Together the properties are diagonally situated in a large square plot, and face approximately due east. They are broadly symmetrical to the front, with a hipped roof with catslides to each side, and side offshoots to the rear. No 4 has a single storey extension to the front side, and No 2 has two detached outbuildings also to the front. A tall hedge appears to the front side of No 2, abutting Great Central Avenue, above

- a concrete fence. No 4 is separated from South Park Way by a concrete fence. A magnolia tree stands in the front garden of No 2.
6. To the south west, the western side of the no-through South Park Way contains a number of dwellings of similar construction, with some exceptions. No 30A is of a different style, with gable ends to the sides. Nos 32 and 34 have been considerably extended, not dissimilarly from what is presently proposed.
 7. The appeal proposal is to add extensions to each of the dwellings that would result in a largely symmetrical arrangement when perceived from the front of the building. The treatments to the sides and rear would differ, with No 4 having a greater rear projection of the proposed 2-storey element, a flat-roofed dormer window to the rear and a retained flat-roofed ground floor extension to the centre rear.
 8. The Hillingdon Residential Extensions SPD of December 2008 ('the SPD') gives design advice on, among other matters, 2 storey extensions as are proposed here. The advice is aimed at achieving a subordinate relationship of extensions to the original house. The proposals depart from the design advice in a number of respects. First, the width of a side extension should be considerably less than the original house and be between half and two thirds of the main house. Although this would be achieved at the base of the property, at the eaves level the width of the resulting houses would be approximately double that of the existing front roof slope. The proposed ridge of the new roofs would be around 3 times the existing width at that height.
 9. Secondly, a new roof should appear subordinate to the original roof and so have a ridge height at least 0.5m lower than the original roof. Achieving this 0.5m set down appears marginal here, but in any event the resulting roofs do not appear subordinate to the original. The overall effect of the proposal here is to subsume the original building rather than to achieve the subordinate relationship sought by the SPD.
 10. Thirdly, any extension should be set back from the existing front elevation, including at the ground floor level. Here, whilst the first floor is set back, the ground floor element is not, continuing the existing projection. Although a departure from the SPD, the ground floor extensions would however largely replace existing extensions on each side.
 11. Fourthly, the SPD advises that on corner plots, where an existing return building line exists, any extension should ensure that the openness of the area is maintained and the return building line is not exceeded. Given the existing ground floor extension (to No 4) and outbuilding (to No 2) the additional effect of the proposal in this regard would be somewhat limited at the ground floor, but the 2 storey nature of the extensions would increase the effect of the protrusion beyond the return building line.
 12. The policy objectives which the SPD seeks to supplement are found in the Hillingdon Local Plan Saved UDP Policies of 2012. These include policy BE13, requiring new development to harmonise with the existing street scene, policy BE15 requiring extensions to harmonise with the original building, and policy BE19 requiring development to complement the amenity and character of the area. Policy BE1 seeks quality design in all new development.

13. Overall I find that these policy objectives would not be met by the proposed development. The effect of the additional bulk and massing at first floor and the new roofs would be disharmonious with the original building, by failing to achieve a subordinate relationship to it, and with the wider street scene by the additional perceived protrusion beyond the return building line.
14. The appellants have referred me to permissions granted at Nos 32 and 34 South Park Way for similar extensions. The officer's report on No 32 discussed the restoration of balance to the overall building by mirroring an existing extension at the adjoining property (in what appears to be an erroneous reference to No 28). A subsequent report concerning proposals at No 34 to raise the height of part of the roof then found that the proposed enlargement of the roof above an existing two storey extension would be acceptable since there was a similar height of roof above the counterpart side extension at No 32. It is therefore not clear whether either proposal would have been permitted had there not already been an existing side extension at No 34, the details of which are not available to me.
15. Those properties lie much further to the south west than the appeal site, and are not nearly as prominent in the street scene as the appeal building. The existence of these permissions at Nos 32 and 34 are not sufficient to persuade me to depart from my conclusions on the effects of the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

16. For the above reasons I consider that the appeal proposal would be contrary to the development plan for the area, supplemented by the advice in the SPD to achieve subordinate extensions. I have considered all matters raised in the appeal, but have found there to be no material considerations of sufficient weight to persuade me to depart from my findings in relation to compliance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Laura Renaudon

INSPECTOR