



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 06 January 2020 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) PIEMA

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3238354

29 St Martins Approach, Ruislip HA4 7QH

- 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 Glenn McCormick against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 19656/APP/2019/2454, dated 22 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. Although the proposal includes a single storey rear extension, both parties agree that this aspect already has planning permission. As such I have focussed my consideration on the proposed two storey side extension.
4. At the time the site visit was undertaken, the existing garage and flat roof extension above, on the south side of the appeal property, had been demolished.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal property is a detached, two storey dwelling located on a residential road. The appeal property is generally typical of the size and style of other properties on the road. The property is bordered to the south by an area of open space (Pinn Meadows). A Public Right of Way (PRoW) runs through the open space adjacent to the south of the property boundary. The appeal property's position next to Pinn Meadows gives it an open setting and the front and south side of the property is highly visible from St Martins Approach when approaching from the south and from within the area of open space itself.

7. The proposed side extension would be flush with the existing front elevation of the appeal property at ground floor and have a small set back at first floor and feature a large crown roof design. Although the extension would include materials to match the existing dwelling and the new crown roof would have the same eaves and ridge height, pitch and materials as the existing roof, the design of the roof would be out of keeping with the existing dwelling which has a half hipped roof on its north side, resulting in an unbalanced appearance when viewed from the front. This is emphasised by the fact the extension has minimal set back. It is not disputed that the proposal would allow sufficient distance from the front and side of the property and some sense of space would be maintained. However, when seen from Pinns Meadow and the PRoW to the south, the bulk of the extension, including a visually dominant and largely blank two-storey wall, would appear imposing.
8. In support of the appeal, the appellant has provided some examples of other properties in the area that feature crown roof extensions and I saw these on my site visit. However, the examples provided do not feature the same design as the proposal, with the majority of those extensions set back from the main front elevation, and so are not as prominent as that proposed. Indeed, the examples do not share the same positioning as the appeal property, adjacent to an area of open space, and are therefore not as visible and not directly comparable. In any case, the appeal has been considered on its own merits.
9. I therefore conclude that, for the above reasons, that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area and be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies (adopted November 2012) which seeks to improve and maintain the quality of the built environment and achieve high quality design. It would also be contrary to Saved Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (adopted 1998) Saved Policies 27th September 2007 which seek to ensure extensions and new development harmonise with the existing street scene, the existing building and complement or improve the amenity and character of the area; and Policy DMHD 1 of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies Adopted Version (January 2020) which seeks to ensure that new extensions respect the design of the original house.
10. It would also be contrary to the Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement (HDAS) Supplementary Planning Document Residential Extensions (December 2008). Whilst it is noted that this specifies no requirement for a set-back in relation to two storey side extensions on detached houses, it does require that extensions are well integrated and this is not considered to be the case with the proposed development.

Other Matters

11. The appellant's wish to add additional living space to the appeal property, and to remove the flat roof side extension are understood. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harm identified. In any case, at the time of my site visit, the garage and flat roof side extension had already been removed and so any aesthetic benefits resulting from the removal of this structure are not a direct benefit of the proposal.
12. Also Whilst I note that the appellant suggests the appeal property could be considered as a 'non designated heritage asset' I have no evidence before me

to suggest that the dwelling, which the appellant states is of a typical sub-urban nature, is worthy of being considered as a non designated heritage asset.

13. The fact that no objections have been received from the occupiers of the neighbouring properties does not lend positive weight to the proposed development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR