



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2025

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/25/3359609

28 Columbia Avenue, Ruislip, Hillingdon HA4 9SU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Petra Disterer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 59385/APP/2024/1247.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor wraparound extension, a second storey side extension, internal alterations and all associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a ground floor wraparound extension, a second storey side extension, internal alterations and all associated works at 28 Columbia Avenue, Ruislip, Hillingdon HA4 9SU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 59385/APP/2024/1247, 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: location plan at 1:1250 scale, and drawing nos. B189002-1000 Rev A, B189002-1100 Rev A and B189002-3100 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises an end of terrace house, which sits on a particularly spacious plot, at the end of a cul-de-sac. This terrace, in common with the other terraces in this part of Columbia Avenue, has a staggered front face, with the dwellings stepped back from one another to varying degrees. The buildings are two storeys high, but the type and colouration of their facing materials is fairly diverse. Mostly they are gabled, although the host and the house at the other end of this terrace terminate with long, hipped roofs.

4. The proposed two storey side extension would exceed half the width of the existing property. However, it would be no deeper than the host, and its 1 metre set back on its front face, and its 0.5 metre set down at ridge level, would respect the articulation and staggered building line which are so characteristic of these terraces; and would ensure that it would appear appropriately subordinate to the host.
5. There would still be a space between the development and the side boundary, and a large gap would be retained to the nearest building on Dollis Crescent to the south. Thus, on this spacious plot, the proposal would not appear cramped. Considered along with the proposed matching materials, all these features ensure that the scheme would be assimilated into the streetscene.
6. Consequently, the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area. It would not therefore conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012), or with Policies DMHB11 and DMHB12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020) ('HLP2'). Amongst other things, and in general terms, these require that extensions should be of a high design quality, which harmonises with its context and enhances local distinctiveness, having regard to matters such as scale, height, mass, plot size, set-backs, streetscape rhythm and materials.
7. As the proposed side extension would exceed half the width of the original property, the scheme would conflict with the requirement at Part C) i) of HLP2 Policy DMHD1. However, given my assessment above, it would nevertheless appear appropriately subordinate to the main dwelling in accordance with its Part A) iii). The scheme would not therefore conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole.
8. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have considered those suggested against the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the standard time limit, in the interests of certainty, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Additionally, to ensure good design and to protect the character and appearance of the host and the area, a condition is necessary requiring that it be carried out in matching materials.
9. For these reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR