
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2020

by Edwin Maund BA (Hons) MSc Dip UP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3243204

1 Hill Rise, Ruislip HA4 7JN

- 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 S Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 62445/APP/2019/2557, dated 30 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is porch extension to side with associated internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Issue

2. The Council has indicated that the extension already constructed does not accord with the details that were approved and may be the subject of enforcement action. The appellants have confirmed this to be the case and have also suggested if appropriate a condition requiring rendering could be added. However, these matters do not go to the heart of this appeal, which I have considered on its own merits.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the local area.

Reasons

4. 1 Hill Rise is a modest detached bungalow which has recently been extended at the side and to the rear. It is typical of the properties in Hill Rise which are predominantly bungalows end onto the street, being rendered with tiled roofs.
5. The properties on the western side of the road are evenly spaced, set back behind hardstandings, creating a strong building line on this side of this suburban residential street, giving a general feeling of space contributing to the character of the area.
6. The properties vary in their individual design characteristics and appearance, however by their general alignment, detached form and relatively consistent plot coverage and size the area has a harmonious appearance. The appeal property is on the inside of a sharp bend, with the recently completed

extension abutting the footpath making the property prominent within the street.

7. I agree with the appellants in so far as the scale of the extension goes, being a modest addition, it would remain subordinate to the main property and would not be too bulky in its appearance, relative to the size of the extended property.
8. The proposed extension, however, whilst modest in size, would be clearly visible in the street. The design is a flat roofed structure creating a box to the front of the extension, which contrasts with rather than complements the existing property and extension. It would fail to complement the architectural style or the roof form of either the extension or the main dwelling and therefore would be an incongruous addition.
9. Being such a visible addition would make it prominent in the street and whilst reasonably localised in its extent, the effect of the scheme would be to diminish the character, appearance of the host property with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the local area.
10. The appeal scheme would thereby be contrary to the objectives set out in the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Policy BE1 – and Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two – Saved UDP Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 which seek to ensure new developments harmonise with the existing street scene, the scale and form of the original property and promote high quality design.

Other Matters

11. The appellants have suggested the extension could be rendered to match the original dwelling if this were to be considered appropriate. Whilst this might arguably be more in keeping with the original property and the predominant character of the other properties in the street, it would not overcome the harm that I have identified.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons set out and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Edwin Maund

INSPECTOR