



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2022

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3296974

12 South Drive, Ruislip, HA4 8EX

- 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 Adam Macintosh against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 13950/APP/2021/4433, dated 4 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the local area, including the Midcroft, Ruislip Area of Special Local Character.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located within the Midcroft, Ruislip Area of Special Local Character (ASLC) in Hillingdon described by the council as a non-designated local heritage asset, which has a character and identity of value, at the site visit I saw that this is principally found in the generally attractive suburban houses set in tree lined streets.
4. The appeal property consists of a detached property located at the junction of South Drive and Croft Gardens, as a result the appeal property is visible to the front and side and is a prominent feature in the local area. The appeal property appears to have been previously extended by a large two-storey extension in the rear garden of the property, of a similar appearance to the original dwelling, and by the erection of an enclosed swimming pool in the rear garden. While the latter appeared to be in a dilapidated condition at the site visit, it is nonetheless shown as being retained on the submitted plans.
5. The proposed single storey side extension is shown on the submitted plans as being of some scale in itself and in proportion to the existing dwelling, the extension is described by the council as being "approximately max 3 metres in width, 9.2 metres in depth and 3.2 metres in height". Furthermore, the submitted plans show a flat roof over the proposed extension in contrast to the pitched roofs over the appeal property.

6. The submitted plans show, and the appellant has referred to, the screening that would be afforded by the close boarded fence to Croft Gardens, described by the appellant as being some 1.8m high. I note that this screening would be limited to the lower part of the extension only.
7. It is my planning judgement that the combination of the proposed extension, itself of some scale, with the existing two storey extension and enclosed swimming pool would not be subservient in scale, character or appearance to the appeal property and as a result of the prominent location of the appeal property, I find that the appeal scheme would harm the character and appearance of the local area including the Midcroft, Ruislip Area of Special Local Character.
8. The appellant provided a personal statement referring, amongst other matters, to a "mobility issue". I have not been provided with any substantive details as to this issue and how the design of the proposed extension relates to this disability and therefore, I afford it only limited weight and as such it does not outweigh the harm I have identified previously.
9. Accordingly, the development would conflict with the character and design provisions of London Plan, 2021 Policy HC1 and policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 1, DMHB 5, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020) Local Plan.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the development would harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and the local area, including the Midcroft, Ruislip Area of Special Local Character contrary to the development plan, the Framework and the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Mr M Brooker

INSPECTOR