



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 October 2020

by Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3246993

5 The Uplands, Ruislip HA4 8QN

- 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 Marek Baldy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 15804/APP/2019/3901, dated 4 June 2018, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is part two storey, part single storey rear extension and part conversion of garage/store to habitable use.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part two storey, part single storey rear extension and part conversion of garage/store to habitable use at 5 The Uplands, Ruislip HA4 8QN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 15804/APP/2019/3901, dated 3 December 2019 and the plans submitted with it, 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: Location Plan; 4103/01A, and 4103/02A.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council altered the description of the development during determination. I have used that description as it is more precise.

Main Issues

3. The effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached 4 bedroomed residential dwelling situated in a residential street known as The Uplands. The character of the area is predominantly suburban with a mixed palette of materials used on the principal elevations of each dwelling. This creates a pleasant variety of designs which are unified by common features such as enclosed porches, render and brick detailing and some bay windows. Most dwellings have a private rear garden, driveway and garage. A number of dwellings near the appeal site have

been subject to alterations and additions, in some cases extending over garages and/or to the rear.

5. The appeal site is overlooked by a number of adjacent residential properties, and at the site visit I observed that some have been subject to extensions/loft conversions. The appeal proposals would result in an enlarged 4 bedroomed house where two of the bedrooms would each have new ensuite bathrooms, together with an enlarged kitchen/dining room, utility room and the addition of a new study on the ground floor. A proportion of the existing garage/storage space would remain as it is.
6. I have considered the concerns of the council, which focus on the scale of the proposal, together with the double-pitch design of the roof of the extension. The ridge of the extension at its highest point would remain below that of the roofline of the existing dwelling.
7. I note that overall the proposed extensions would not be easily seen from the public domain, save for the elevation to the north. However, I do not consider the development as a whole would result in an incongruous addition and would not be sufficiently visible that it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. Policies DMHD 1 (Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings), DMHD 11 (Design of New Development) and DMHD 12 (Streets and Public Realm) of the London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies (LP2) all seek development that does not adversely affect local character and appearance and integrates within its surroundings.
9. Whilst the scheme will result in a significant extension to the property, I do not agree that this would result in offence to the above policies.

Conclusions

10. For the above reasons and subject to the conditions listed, which have been applied in the interests of certainty and precision, the appeal is allowed.

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR