



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 August 2021

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3278766

33A Ickenham Road, Ruislip HA4 7BZ

- 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 & Mrs Rattan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 16501/APP/2021/1336 dated 1 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of rear part single, part double storey extension with 2no. rear facing dormers in loft space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of rear part single, part double storey extension with 2no. rear facing dormers in loft space at 33A Ickenham Road, Ruislip HA4 7BZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 16501/APP/2021/1336 dated 1 April 2021, 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: Site location plan; 2021-Ickenham-P6-01; 2021-Ickenham-P6-02; 2021-Ickenham-P6-03; 2021-Ickenham-P6-04.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the new windows in the side elevations at first floor level have been fitted with obscure glazing and no part of those windows that is less than 1.7m above the floor level of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. The windows shall thereafter be retained as installed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the application was determined, the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) has been revised in July 2021. However, I do not consider that the changes directly affect the appeal proposal before me, but all references are to the July 2021 version.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the existing property and the Ruislip Village Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached property on the south side of Ickenham Road, dating from the middle of the last century and was originally infill development. The property has since been extended and altered, including with a side flat roofed dormer which is very visible in the street scene. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, with mainly detached dwellings, some quite recently built.
5. The appeal site lies within the designated heritage asset of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The character and appearance of the Conservation Area, particularly the residential area to the south west of the medieval village core retains many attributes of a garden suburb, exemplified by attractive buildings in verdant surroundings, which contribute to its significance.
6. The proposal would remove the existing flat roofed side dormer and would replace with a part single and part two storey side extension stepped back from the front elevation. At the rear there would be a full width 4m extension at ground floor with a first floor extension set in both from the sides as well as the rear with a new roof with dormers.
7. The Council raises no objection to the ground floor extension, and I agree that the width and depth of this element would be in proportion with the size of the existing property. The first floor element and roof would be set in from both sides of the property and set back from the full depth of the ground floor extension and would as a result reduce the bulk and overall massing of the extension. The rear dormers would be small scale and appropriately set within the rear roof slope so that they would not appear overly large or result in a 'top heavy development'.
8. I have taken into account criterion viii) of Section B of Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) (LP Part Two: DMP); which sets out that large crown roofs on detached houses will not be supported. There would be an element of crown roof in the centre of the roof, but it would be relatively small in scale and not overly visible; I do not consider that it would fall to be considered as a large crown roof and therefore in conflict with this policy. Furthermore and contrary to the views of the Council, there are a number of crown roofs in close proximity to the appeal property.
9. The side extension would be set back and with its hipped roof, would ensure an appropriate gap to the neighbouring property. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed development, taken all together would be well designed and in keeping with the existing property and so would respect its existing character and appearance.
10. I also consider that the property as extended would be appropriate within its plot, would relate well to the neighbouring properties and would be of a high quality design to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The design of the side extension would also ensure that the sense of spaciousness with the adjoining property would be retained.

11. Furthermore, the proposed removal of the existing flat roofed side dormer, and its replacement with a more traditional two storey form under an extended hipped roof would be an enhancement to both the character and appearance of the property and to the Conservation Area. I have noted that this would remove the existing cat slide roof and although there are other examples in the vicinity I do not consider that such features are a key characteristic of the Conservation Area.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would not only preserve but would enhance the character and appearance of the existing building and of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area. There would therefore be no conflict with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012); Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the LP Part Two: DMP and the Framework, and in particular Sections 12 and 16, all of which seek a high quality design which respects the local context and seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment.
13. I have been provided with an appeal decision for a different proposed extension to the property under Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3262668. That appeal related to a different scheme and each proposal must be judged on its individual merits. However, I have found nothing in that decision which conflicts with the decision I have reached in this case.

Conditions and Conclusion

14. In terms of conditions, I agree with the Council that the materials should match those used on the existing building in order to protect the character and appearance of the existing building and the Conservation Area. A condition should be imposed to list the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. Although noted on the plans, for the sake of completeness I have also added a condition to require the new windows in the side elevations to be in obscure glazing and top opening only in order to protect the amenities of adjoining neighbours.
15. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR