
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2021

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 6 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/20/3263794

62 Station Approach, South Ruislip HA4 6SA

- 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 Alistair Coomer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 2850/APP/2020/1349, dated 28 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is a second-floor front and rear extensions to existing flat and addition of a third floor to allow for creation of a self-contained 2-bed flat, with associated bin and bicycle storage and parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appellant has submitted a revised proposal with the appeal which seeks to vary the appearance of the roof of the extension from that determined by the Council. Advice published by the Planning Inspectorate in the 'Procedural Guidance: Planning appeals – England' indicates that if an appellant thinks that amending their proposal will overcome the reason for refusal, they should normally make a fresh application. It adds that the planning appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and that it is important that what is considered by the Inspector is essentially what was considered by the local planning authority and which interested people's views were sought. Notwithstanding the fact that the appellant had sent a copy of the revised scheme to the Council I am aware that the Council and others have not had the opportunity to formally consider and make comments on the revised proposal and so their interests may be prejudiced if I were to consider the revised scheme. Therefore, I shall determine the appeal based on the scheme that was considered and refused by the Council and not the revision contained within the appeal documents.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to this 3-story building which is used partly as offices, with some residential elements. It shares some design features with the larger

- building at No 54-60 Station Approach but is more akin to Nos 64 and 66-66b Station Approach in its height and scale, when seen from the front.
5. The top floor of the existing building has a steeply pitched tile section on its front elevation and the windows are partly recessed within the slope. Thereafter, the roof has a shallower pitch with a central ridge. The rear elevation contains a similar arrangement but is dominated by the narrow stair tower which extends from the rear elevation and has a flat roof.
 6. The proposal would result in the brick elevations extending upwards to replace the tiled elevations on the second floor. The proposed front elevation would then have a steep section, then a very shallow pitched section and a large flat area. The proposed windows would span the transition between the steep and shallow pitched tiled sections at the front. At the rear there would just be an extended steep tiled section before the flat roof; over the stairway there would be an extension with a part-pitched roof with a flat section.
 7. Within the street-scene here the existing building provides a transition in terms of height and mass between the larger form at No 54-60 and the distinctly more modest and domestic scale at Nos 64 to 66b. This aligns with the more predominant domestic land use and modest scale of buildings on Bourne Avenue and on Station Approach, beyond its junction with Bourne Avenue.
 8. Although the total overall addition of height is said to be 1m by the appellant, the additional mass of the proposed extension would be considerable. The additional floor, the alterations to the second floor and the steep pitch of the new section of elevation at the front would mean that the building would appear much larger than the existing one. In addition, the proposed variations in the roof form with the proposed front windows breaking the transition and resulting in oddly shaped dormers would represent a poor design which would heighten the effects of the additional form to the building.
 9. Within the rear, the addition to the stair tower would add to this already obvious and somewhat incongruous element of the building. Whilst it would have a pitched roof over part of it, this would not be sufficient to make it blend or harmonise with the locality and the development in total would make it stand out more within views from Bourne Avenue.
 10. Therefore, I consider that the proposal would have an unacceptable visual effect on the locality. It would fail to harmonise with the surrounding area and would result in clear harm to it. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Council's Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies.
 11. The proposal would bring about an addition to the supply of new homes, within an accessible location. I have taken account of this and any other benefits that may arise from the proposal but find that they are insufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR