



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2025 by N Manley BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by S Edwards BA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/25/3363245

32 Ickenham Road, Ruislip, Hillingdon HA4 7BX

- 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 V Birla against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref is 12766/APP/2024/3307.
 - The development proposed is described as a “Conversion of integral garage to habitable accommodation, erection of a part single storey, part two storey extension to the side and rear storey extension to the side and rear.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the conversion of integral garage to habitable accommodation, erection of a part single storey, part two storey extension to the side and rear at 32 Ickenham Road, Ruislip, Hillingdon HA4 7BX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 12766/APP/2024/3307, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: 001 Rev: B; 002 Rev: B.
 - 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.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of the proposed works detailed on the application form has been amended in subsequent documents. I have adopted the description used in the Council's decision notice, which reflects accurately the proposal before me.
4. The appeal site is situated in the Ruislip Village Conservation Area (RVCA). I shall therefore have special regard to section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the appeal property and whether it would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the RVCA.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. According to the Ruislip Village Conservation Area Appraisal (RVCAA), Ickenham Road lies within a part of the village where the street pattern preserves the framework of medieval lanes. The area's development during the 1920s and 1930s was shaped by the Garden Suburb movement, resulting in generously spaced houses set within large, mature gardens. These plots contribute significantly to the green and spacious character of the RVCA. Architecturally, Ickenham Road is predominantly characterised by substantial detached properties from the interwar period, featuring rendered elevations, prominent chimney stacks, half-hipped gables and decorative timber detailing. In the context of this appeal, the RVCA's special interest derives from its historic street layout, the influence of early Garden Suburb principles, and the distinctive quality and variety of its detached homes, all set within a spacious and verdant residential setting.
7. 32 Ickenham Road (no 32) is a substantial two-storey detached dwelling located on the northern side of Ickenham Road. Like most of its immediate neighbours, it occupies the full width of its plot due to a single-storey side extension to the west and a two-storey element to the east. The property is set back from the highway, behind a brick wall and partially screened by mature coniferous planting. The house is finished in a pastel-toned render, with its roofscape, altered through various extensions, presenting a mix of styles. To the rear, the existing single-storey extension projects deeper than the original dwelling. However, no 32 benefits from a generously sized garden, comparable in size and proportions to neighbouring plots. In this setting, as a large, detached property within a spacious plot, no 32 remains in keeping with the prevailing character of the area, making a positive contribution to the character and special interest of the RVCA.
8. When compared with the scale and proportions of the existing dwelling, its plot size, and neighbouring properties, the cumulative impact of the additions would not appear visually excessive or prominent. Although the proposal would extend the ground floor across the full width of the property, its overall depth would remain broadly consistent with the existing single-storey rear extension. Given the overall size of the plot, the increase in depth would be marginal and closely aligned with the depth of the scheme for which the Council granted planning permission in 2024 (Local Planning Authority Reference 12766/APP/2024/2770).
9. Similarly, although the two-storey element would be wider than that approved in 2024 and would represent a noticeable enlargement when viewed from the rear, it would remain visually subservient. The original ridge height would still be evident, with the proposed additions being set down, thus ensuring that they would not dominate the host property. The additional volume would be significantly smaller than that of the existing dwelling and the additions would fit comfortably within the generous proportions of the rear garden. For these reasons, the scale of the proposal would not overwhelm the host building and its plot. As the RVCA's special interest derives in part from large dwellings set within spacious plots, the proposal

would preserve that character and would not harm the appearance of either the host property or the RVCA.

10. Concerns have been raised about the design of the proposal, particularly the roof form. While the proposed arrangement of three evenly spaced hipped roof features would differ from the scheme approved in 2024, it would not represent a significant departure from that design, with the overall form and composition remaining broadly comparable.
11. Furthermore, these roof alterations would be confined to the rear of the property and would not be visible from the street scene, where a wide variety of roof forms is already present. The variation in roof forms and ridge heights, coupled with the more stepped nature of the proposal when compared to the previously approved scheme from 2024, would prevent the extensions from appearing as a box-like mass. Given that the RVCA's special interest includes architectural variety rather than uniformity, and no 32 already displays a variety of roof styles, the proposed roof alterations would not harm the character or appearance of the host property or the conservation area.
12. No concerns have been raised by the Council regarding the proposed side extension, which has been approved as part of the previous planning application, or the proposed garage conversion. Based on my site observations and assessment of the presented evidence, there are no reasons for me to reach an alternative view.
13. Overall, and having regard to the previous planning approval, I conclude that the cumulative impact of the existing and proposed additions would be acceptable. Given the above, the proposal would cause no harm to the appeal property and would preserve the character and appearance of the RVCA as a whole. I therefore find no conflict with Policies HE1 and BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part One – Strategic Policies (adopted 2012), Policies DMHD1 and DMHB4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two – Development Management Policies (adopted 2020) (HLP2), Policy D3 of the London Plan (adopted 2021) or Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
14. Amongst other things, these policies require development to be appropriate to the identity and context of Hillingdon's townscape; conserve and enhance Hillingdon's distinct and varied environment; ensure there is no adverse cumulative impact on the character and appearance of the wider area; preserve the character and appearance of conservation areas; harmonise with local context by taking into account the surrounding scale of development; and respond to and be sympathetic to the existing character of a place and its history.
15. I have had regard to policy DHMB 12 of the HLP2. However, this policy primarily relates to public realm design and landscaping improvements in areas close to transport interchanges and community facilities. Given the nature and location of the appeal proposal, I consider it of limited relevance to the appeal before me and I have found no conflict with it.

Other Matters

16. I have taken into account all representations made on the proposal, including regarding a potential loss of privacy and sunlight to neighbouring properties. These considerations were addressed within the Council's case officer report, identifying

no harmful impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents. Based on my assessment of the evidence and my observations during my site visit, I see no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusions in this regard. I have also had regard to representations related to the effect of construction activity, including possible disruption and congestion. However, any such impacts would be temporary in nature and, as this proposal is simply for a domestic extension, would be limited overall.

17. Concerns have also been raised that the property is used for business purposes, leading to vehicles parking on pavements or across driveways and creating a pedestrian safety risk. However, the Council has determined that the scheme provides adequate parking provision and there is no evidence before me that the extension itself would materially increase the risk to pedestrians. In any case, any issues relating to the conduct of existing activities, including obstructive parking or the operation of the business fall outside the scope of this appeal. I have assessed the appeal proposal on its own merits and relevant planning considerations.

Conditions

18. In addition to the standard time limit, I shall impose a condition specifying the relevant drawings which the development must accord with, in the interests of certainty and to provide clarity. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, a condition is attached to require that external materials match those of the existing building.

Conclusion and Recommendation

19. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

N Manley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

20. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR