



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2022

by J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/21/3283960

Ruislip Nursing Home, 173 West End Road, Ruislip HA4 6LB

- 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 Cader, Ruislip Nursing Home against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 19817/APP/2021/914, dated 9 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is new front entrance porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have also dealt with an appeal proposing an outbuilding on the site. That proposal is the subject of a separate decision¹.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building, a Locally Listed Building, and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site includes a detached building identified by the Council as a Locally Listed Building, and which therefore comprises a 'non-designated heritage asset' in accordance with the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
5. The building has distinctive features including a steep pitched hipped roof with finials along the ridge; gold brick exterior with red brick dressings and string course; and gauged brick surrounds to windows and an arched door entrance. Despite a fairly large modern rear extension and side projection, these result in an attractive and well-proportioned building, particularly when viewed from the street to the front. In my view, the architectural and historic interest of the building as an example of a former farmhouse dated by the Local List entry to around 1872 add much to its significance as a non-designated heritage asset.
6. The proposed porch would be of modest scale with a roof form and external materials that would be generally sympathetic to those of the host building. Nevertheless, I consider that the projection of the roof above the string course between the building's floors and larger entrance doors would be visually

¹ Appeal reference APP/R5510/W/21/3283965

jarring and would result in an awkward relationship with the host building. The development would additionally obscure views of the existing arched door entrance which adds to the distinctive appearance and thus significance of the building. In contrast to existing extensions which are to the rear or set back from the front elevation of the building, the porch would be readily visible from the street scene increasing the visual impact of the development. In combination, I find that these factors would result in a discordant development that would harm the character and appearance of the building, and that there would be consequent detriment to the character and appearance of the area.

7. In weighing applications that affect non-designated heritage assets, the Framework advises that a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. The appellant advises that the porch is intended to provide a protected entrance for wheelchair access and visitors to the nursing home, and to provide an additional level of security and allow for lateral flow testing and checking of personal protective equipment made necessary by the COVID-19 pandemic. However, I saw that there is already an internal entrance lobby to the building, and while this would be enlarged by the proposal, the limited detail before me does not provide compelling evidence that this is inadequate to accommodate requirements.
8. The harm to the significance of the Locally Listed Building would be modest given the limited scale of the development and that it would affect only a small part of the building. Even so, I find taking a balanced judgement that the benefits of the proposal are insufficient to outweigh the harm to the significance of the building, and I conclude that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the Locally Listed Building and the surrounding area.
9. Accordingly, there would be conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies 2012 and policies DMHB 1, DMHB 3 and DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two – Development Management Policies 2020. Amongst other things, these policies advise that proposals will be permitted where they retain the significance, appearance, character or setting of a Locally Listed Building, and require high quality design which enhances local distinctiveness and development that avoids harm to the historic environment. The proposal would also be contrary to the Framework insofar as it seeks generally to conserve and enhance the historic environment and the significance of heritage assets.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would conflict with the development plan when it is read as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that a decision contrary to the development plan should be reached. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Bowyer

INSPECTOR