



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 April 2023

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3307379

18 Church Avenue, Hillingdon, Ruislip HA4 7HT

- 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 Magon against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 59225/APP/2022/616, dated 24 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2022.
 - The development proposed was originally described as the demolition of the existing single storey rear extension and erection of single and double storey rear extension together with loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. This part of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area (CA) is characterised by large residential properties. The CA appraisal highlights that the houses date to the 1920's-1930's and many have retained their original details. The host property is not one of the more distinctive and attractive houses, which have timber clad features on the external elevation. However, its size and form sit comfortably in the street scene, and it does not detract from the character or appearance of this part of the CA. It has a distinctive three-dimensional form resulting from its shape, layout, and hipped roof. This form is, in my view, an important component of the building's character.
4. The modest step from the ridge, and the depth and width of the proposed rear gable projection, would combine to result in a top heavy and unduly bulky extension. The design, bringing the gable projection close to the rear first floor window, with minimal space to the side of the window, would emphasise the unduly bulky nature of the gable projection. The resulting form and massing of the two-storey gable projection would jar injuriously with the distinctive three-dimensional hipped roof form of the host property.
5. The pitched roof to the rear dormer would exacerbate the departure from the simple hipped roof form. Moreover, the ground floor bi-fold doors serving the family/dining area would create an awkward and jarring visual arrangement with the upper floors as it spans across both the gable and flat roof section.
6. The combination of these elements would result in a scheme that would subsume most of the rear elevation of the host property but in a manner that

- would fail to harmonise with it even with matching materials. The presence of pitched roofs and gables elsewhere within the street does not alter the effects from the design on the character and appearance of the appeal property.
7. The front alterations would be modest, and I do not consider them to be harmful. Moreover, the rear development would not be prominent within the wider CA. However, even small incremental alterations can erode the quality of an area and the proposed development would be seen in private views.
 8. Overall, the proposed development would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. The harm would be localised to this part of the CA and the effects would be less than substantial in the context of paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). In accordance with paragraph 202 I must balance that less than substantial harm against the public benefits of the development.
 9. I note that the appellant made changes to the scheme with the view to finding a solution. However, that is not a matter for my consideration, and I must determine the appeal on its own merits. I accept that the appellant is seeking to improve the living conditions of the property. However, personal circumstances are not public benefits and I give them limited weight.
 10. Heritage assets are irreplaceable and great weight should be given to their conservation. Accordingly, there are no public benefits that would outweigh the less than substantial harm to the CA. The proposal would therefore conflict with the requirements of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), and the Framework, when taken together and insofar as they relate to this matter.
 11. These say, amongst other things, that planning applications relating to alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure that all extensions in Conservation Areas are designed in keeping with the original house, in terms of layout, scale, proportions, roof form, window pattern, detailed design and materials.
 12. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR