



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 June 2023

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/22/3313703

56 Beech Avenue, Ruislip, Hillingdon HA4 8UQ

- 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 Anupam Prakash against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 77438/APP/2022/2344 dated 21 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as Single Storey Rear and Part Side Extension, Raising of Garage Roof and Conversion of Garage into a Habitable Space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Single Storey Rear and Part Side Extension, Raising of Garage Roof and Conversion of Garage into a Habitable Space at 56 Beech Avenue, Ruislip, Hillingdon HA4 8UQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 77438/APP/2022/2344 dated 21 July 2022, and the plans submitted with it, 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: Drawing No's OSMAP, BA56—01-1003 and BA56—01-1004.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of existing property and area in general.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The site is a semi-detached two storey property within a predominantly residential area. A modest detached garage is located to the rear of the property. The existing property is not of architectural merit.

4. The proposed single storey development would wrap around the side and rear of the existing property linking to the existing garage. Whilst there would be an increase in height of the garage, overall development would be relatively low in height.
5. In combination the proposed development would have a large footprint. The existing garage at No. 58 Beech Avenue would screen to a degree the bulk of the proposed development. There would also be limited views of the mass of the proposed development from public vantage points. Notwithstanding this the proposed development would be visible to neighbouring properties, however due to the existing garage and the relatively unobtrusive design I find that the proposed development would not appear disproportionate or incongruous to the existing property or area in general.
6. I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the existing property and area in general. There is no conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon's A Vision for 2026, Local Plan: Part 1, Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 the Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020), Policy D3 the London Plan (2021) which amongst other things seek to ensure developments are of high quality design which respect the design of the original property and surrounding area.
7. There is no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) which seeks amongst other things to ensure developments are of good design which adds to the overall quality of an area.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.
9. I have imposed conditions relating to standard time limit for commencement of development and plans to be adhered to as this provides certainty. I have also added a condition concerning materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR