



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 13 October 2020

by Rachel Walmsley MSc, MA, BSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3248550
2 Chichester Avenue, Ruislip, HA4 7EH

- 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 Ms Irene Ting against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 4813/APP/2019/3502, dated 24 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of part two storey side extension and conversion of existing garage space. Erection of single storey rear extension and associated internal works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is part of a planned development which comprises detached houses that sit comfortably within their plots. Being on a prominent corner plot and opposite the Ruislip Conversation Area, the appeal property is of utmost importance in defining the character and appearance of the area. Within proximity of the appeal property are houses that have characteristics of the garden suburb tradition, namely gables and tile hanging. The gables create a relaxed rhythm of projections which produce some uniformity in the street scene. Tile hanging has, in places, been replaced with render and so, whilst tile hanging is a feature of the area, it is less of a defining characteristic.
4. Whilst in views from the north the new gable may sit comfortably with the existing, in other vantage points it would compete in scale with the existing gable, appearing overly dominant on the front elevation of the property. The gable would also add considerably to the overall bulk and mass of the property, creating a dwelling that would be significantly larger than the other houses in the same row. As a result, the proposal would appear unduly prominent and incongruous in the street scene.
5. The white/cream render would emphasise the form and scale of the gables, exacerbating the harm identified. In principle, render would not be out-of-keeping with the street scene given that rendering has replaced tile hanging. However, the degree of rendering proposed would appear stark and obtrusive.

6. No objection has been raised to and no adverse impacts identified for living conditions. However, this does not address the harm to the character and appearance of the area.
7. The property currently comprises a good-sized family home. The benefit of the development to create a high-quality family home therefore carries no weight.
8. For the reasons given, the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and therefore contrary to policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 and policies DMHD 1 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 which seek development that, amongst other matters, has no adverse impact on local character and the appearance of the street.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Walmsley

INSPECTOR