



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/21/3270369

5 Sherwood Avenue, Ruislip HA4 7XL

- 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 Jones against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref: 48075/APP/2020/4308 dated 28 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is part first floor front /two storey rear extension, garage conversion and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part first floor front /two storey rear extension, garage conversion and internal alterations at 5 Sherwood Avenue, Ruislip HA4 7XL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 48075/APP/2020/4308 dated 28 December 2020, 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; 4471/01 and 4471/02.
 - 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 extensions hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the proposed privacy screens to the rear windows at first floor level have been installed, in strict accordance with details that have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The privacy screens shall be retained and maintained 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 property and the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a good-sized detached house on the eastern side of Sherwood Avenue within a predominantly residential area. The surrounding area mainly comprises detached houses of individual design, many of which have been subsequently altered and extended. Front gable bays with mock Tudor detailing are a feature within the local street scene.
5. The proposal would include a first floor front extension in place of the existing dormer window within a cat slide roof and a two storey rear extension across the width of the property.
6. The proposed front extension would be modest in size and proportions and would ensure that the front projecting gable bay would remain the central dominant element in terms of the character and appearance of the property. The proposed extension would therefore be subservient to this key feature. The existing cat slide roof would be removed but although retained by some properties, they do not appear as a key characteristic feature of the local street scene.
7. There would be a sizeable extension over two storeys at the rear, but it would not increase the overall width of the property or materially increase its overall height. Although the rear elevation would be changed in its form from the existing rear elevation, I do not consider that the existing rear elevation has particular design merit which would require to be retained or replicated. The proposed extension would continue the hipped roofs and projecting gable bays which are a characteristic feature of the existing house and other properties in the local area. The bulk and massing would be reduced by the set back of the extensions under hipped roofs on either side of the projecting extension under a gable roof. This would continue the rhythm of development found within the local area.
8. The proposed front and rear extensions would not materially diminish the sense of spaciousness to the side boundaries and to the neighbouring properties. I am satisfied that the form, scale and design of the proposed extensions would respect the character and appearance of the local area, taking into account the pattern of development in the vicinity.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed extensions would not harm but would respect the character and appearance of the existing building and of the local area. There would be no conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DHMB11 and DHMB12 and of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020) (LP Part Two: DMP), as well as the Framework and in particular Section 12, all of which seek a high quality design which respects the local context. Although the proposals would not fully comply with some of the specific criteria under DMHD1 of LP Part Two: DMP, I am satisfied that taken all together the proposals would respect the overall objectives and guidelines under this policy to ensure that proposed extensions to residential dwellings would be appropriate to the existing building and to the local context. I therefore find

that these minor infringements of a small number of the very specific criteria under Policy DMHD1 would not weigh heavily against the approval of the scheme and that the scheme would still comply with the overall design aims of the relevant policies as set out above.

Other Considerations

10. The appeal site is the subject of a group Tree Preservation Order (TPO459) but no trees would be affected by the proposed extensions.

Conditions and Conclusion

11. 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 local area. A condition should be imposed to list the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have also added a condition to require details of the proposed privacy screens to be submitted and approved by the Council and then installed in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the extensions.
12. 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