



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 18 March 2025

by **S A Hanson BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date 09 April 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/R5510/C/23/3331678

Appeal B Ref: APP/R5510/C/23/3331679

7A Manor Road, Ruislip HA4 7LA

- The appeals are made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Appeal A is made by Mrs S Bains and Appeal B is made by Mr J Bains against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The notice was issued on 12 September 2023.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: Without planning permission, the erection of 3 x rear dormers and small front gable.
 - The requirements of the notice are to:
 - (i) Demolish and remove the 3 x rear dormers OR (ii) Alter the 3 x rear dormer windows so that they accord with the dimensions and appearance, scale, fenestration and positioning within the rear roof slope, as shown on drawing numbers 01A and 02A (dated March 2019) approved under Appeal decision ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3232120 dated 23 September 2019.
 - AND
 - (iii) Demolish and remove the small front gable OR (iv) Alter the front elevation so that it accords with the dimension, scale, fenestration and positioning, as shown on drawing numbers 01A and 02A (dated March 2019) approved under Appeal decision ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3232120 dated 23 September 2019.
 - (v) Remove from the land all debris, items, building materials resulting from compliance with points (i) to (iv) above.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is three (3) calendar months.
 - The appeals are proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.
-

Appeal C Ref: APP/R5510/W/23/3330996

7A Manor Road, Ruislip HA4 7LA

- 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 Mr and Mrs S Bains against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 69063/APP/2023/1490.
 - The development proposed is described as alterations to existing planning permission for roof extension to dwellinghouse – as built.
-

Decisions

Appeals A and B

1. The appeals are allowed, the enforcement notice is quashed and planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act (as amended) for the development already carried out, namely the erection of 3 x rear dormers and small front gable.

Appeal C

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 'alterations to existing planning permission for roof extension to dwellinghouse – as built' at 7A Manor Road, Ruislip HA4 7LA in accordance with the terms of the application ref: 69063/APP/2023/1490.

Preliminary Matters

3. Appeals were made by both Mr and Mrs Bains against the enforcement notice on ground (a) which was fee exempt because of the appeal against the planning application refusal. As the appeals against the enforcement notice and the planning refusal are for the same development, I shall deal with them together.
4. Planning permission was granted on appeal dated 23 September 2019 (ref: APP/R5510/D/19/3232120) for a roof extension to the dwellinghouse which involved the conversion of the hipped roof to a gable roof and the installation of three dormer windows on the rear roof slope and a small gable feature to the front elevation. The three dormer windows and the small gable feature were not constructed in accordance with the approval and are the subject of the current appeals. The key differences relate to the increase in size of the three dormers in respect of their height and size of openings, and the re-positioning of the front gable feature and the addition of glazing.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Ruislip Village Conservation Area (the CA) in terms of its visual impact on the appeal property and the street scene.

Reasons

6. The appeal property lies within the CA and makes a positive contribution, assimilating well with the surrounding properties and street scene. I have applied the statutory duty in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA by attaching considerable importance and weight to that desirability.
7. The appeal relates to a two-storey detached dwelling which was constructed as an infill property. It is subservient in scale to the nearby properties and has a driveway to the front and private garden to the rear. The rear gardens of the appeal property and its close neighbours join the rear gardens of properties on Church Avenue and King Edward's Road. The gardens are sizeable, and, on the whole, there is a substantial distance between the rear of the houses.
8. The CA is set around the medieval core of the area and consists of a mix of residential and commercial properties with varied architectural detailing. Manor Road lies in Character Area 3 which is described by the Ruislip Village Conservation Area Appraisal July 2010 as a residential area to the west of the High Street and commercial area. It comprises mainly 20th Century houses and bungalows with varied appearances and architectural styles and includes large, detached properties, many with half-timbered and rendered elevations and strong gable features. Materials are mostly red brick and light-coloured render beneath red clay tiled roofs.

9. The constructed flat roof dormers are evenly spaced along the rear roof slope, set down from the ridge and while they are more prominent in scale from those previously allowed, they have a narrow vertical emphasis which draws the eye down. Being constructed in from the outer edges of the roof, using matching roof tiles for most of the visible outer surfaces to the front and sides, and slim glazing bars in a similar style and colour to match the existing fenestration, they align with the outer edges of the windows below providing an element of symmetry. While the French doors to the middle opening appear slightly out of place at that level, they visually reflect the style of openings to the single storey ground floor projection to the rear.
10. Overall, the dormers are adequately set down from the ridge, set in from the sides of the roof slope and evenly placed on the roof slope. The dimensions and design of the dormers, in relation to the existing features of the rear elevation of the property, are not so inconsistent as to be significantly harmful to the architectural composition of the existing building or the character and appearance of the property. Furthermore, being on the rear elevation, and with views restricted to the rear of a few neighbouring properties, any impact on the CA will be limited.
11. The gable feature on the front elevation sits above the eaves within the roof slope and is a modest addition. It is glazed to allow light to the stairwell. Replicating the angles of roof lines displayed on this elevation, it assimilates with the property's features. Being of a limited size on a relatively modern property which replicates features of timber framing on its front gable, its presence has a limited impact on the appearance of the dwelling particularly due to the array of openings on this elevation. Furthermore, there are examples of many different roof forms within the vicinity, with chalet bungalows, dormers and projecting gables. In this context, the addition does not present as an incongruous anomaly within the street scene.
12. Accordingly, I consider that the development is not unduly detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property as to cause harm. Furthermore, I find that the development, as a whole, does not harm the character or appearance of the CA and thus preserves its significance. Consequently, the development accords with Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020), Policies HC1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). These seek, among other things, to achieve high quality design which harmonises with the existing street scene, the original building and the character of the area, and conserves or enhances Conservation Areas.

Conditions

13. The council has not suggested any conditions and as the development is complete, I consider that there is no clear justification to impose any at this stage.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters, I conclude that the appeals should be allowed.

S A Hanson INSPECTOR