



Appeal Statement

Householder Extensions
AT
4 Almond Avenue,
Ickenham UB10 8NA

Reference:
4AA-2973

Date:
17 February 2025

1. Introduction

- a. This Appeal Statement has been prepared by Just Planning on behalf of Mr & Mrs Sabharwal to support an appeal against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon to refuse planning permission for extensions to 4 Almond Avenue, in Ickenham.
- b. Following a description of the site and surrounding area, the report will consider the planning history, set out an overview of relevant planning policy and outline the case for the appellants.
- c. It will be demonstrated that the proposal complies with relevant local and national policies and that planning permission should therefore be granted.

2. Background

- a. On 15 October 2025, the appellants submitted a planning application to London Borough of Hillingdon for the following development (reference: 61421/APP/2025/2697):

Erection of a single storey side & part single, part double storey rear extension and Enlargement of loft space to form habitable accommodation including 2 side dormers.

- b. In a decision notice dated 16 January 2026, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) advised that the application had been refused for the following reason:

1. *The proposed development, by reason of the introduction of two side dormer extensions, would result in an unacceptable and visually intrusive alteration to the original roof form of the host dwelling. The dormers would interrupt the previously unbroken side roof slopes through their cumulative impact which would erode the simple and coherent roofscape of this group of mid-20th century properties, thereby appearing as discordant additions within the street scene. Overall, the development would fail to preserve the character and appearance of Ickenham Village Conservation Area causing less than substantial harm to the conservation area without any notable public benefit. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies and Policies DMHB 4, DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two (2020).*

3. Site Description

- a. The appeal property is a two-storey, detached house located on the northern side of Almond Avenue. The house is brick-built beneath a tiled, hipped roof. It has a front projecting bay window and a front porch. It is set back a little from the street behind an area of off-street parking. There is a long garden to the rear.
- b. The immediate surrounding area is suburban and residential in character with a wide mix of housing types. There are also commercial uses nearby on Long Lane and Swakeleys Road.
- c. Many of the houses along Almond Avenue have been extended and altered in various ways, contributing to a diverse streetscene.
- d. The property is not listed but it is located in the designated Ickenham Village Conservation Area.

4. Relevant Planning History & Appeal Proposal

- a. In February 2021, planning permission was refused for a scheme comprising a single-storey side extension and a part single, part two-storey rear extension under application reference 61421/APP/2020/3858.
- b. A subsequent appeal was allowed by an Inspector under reference APP/R5510/D/21/3270366. In allowing the appeal, the Inspector concluded that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Ickenham Village Conservation Area and would comply with the statutory duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- c. Planning permission was then granted on 6 February 2025 under application reference 61421/APP/2024/2854 for a proposal that was identical to the scheme previously allowed on appeal.
- d. The current application sought planning permission for a single storey side extension, a part single, part double storey rear extension, and the enlargement of the roof space to form habitable accommodation, including two side dormers.
- e. The side and rear extensions proposed as part of the current scheme are very similar to those approved under the two earlier permissions. In determining the current application, the council therefore raised no objection to the side or rear extensions.
- f. The sole reason for refusal relates to the proposed side dormers and their effect on the roof form and the character and appearance of the Ickenham Village Conservation Area.
- g. Works have commenced and the structure of the dormers is now visible, allowing a clear understanding of their scale and siting. Figure 1, on the next page, shows the front elevation of the house with the dormer structures in place.



Figure 1: Photograph of the front of the house.

- h. Each dormer is positioned on a side roof slope, set below the main ridge line and contained within the existing roof form. There is no increase in the ridge height of the dwelling. The detailed design, scale and visual effect of the dormers are considered in the sections that follow.

5. Planning Policy

- a. Planning law states that decisions on planning applications must be taken in accordance with the statutory development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- b. The relevant parts of the development plan for the area are the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and the London Plan (2021).
- c. According to the decision notice, the development fails to comply with policy BE1 of the Strategic Policies, policies DMHB 4, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Development Management Policies and policy D3 of the London Plan.
- d. Policy BE1 (Built Environment) of the Strategic Policies requires that all new development improve the quality of the built environment in order to create successful and sustainable neighbourhoods. Among other things, the policy states that development proposals should be sensitive to local identity, landscapes, townscapes and views, improve areas of poor environmental quality, improve the quality of the public realm, and not result in the inappropriate development of gardens and green spaces that erode the character of suburban areas.
- e. Policy DMHB 11 (Design of New Development) requires that all new development exhibit a high quality of design. Development should harmonise with its surroundings in terms of its scale, size and detailed design. It should use high quality materials. It should not unacceptably harm the residential amenity of close neighbours.
- f. Policy DMHB 12 (Streets and Public Realm) relates to the public realm design and improvements and does not appear to be relevant to the application proposal, which is confined to the curtilage of the dwelling only.
- g. Policy DMHD 1 (Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings) sets out criteria for extensions. It seeks to ensure that there is:

"no adverse cumulative impact of the proposal on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area"

- h. In relation to roof extensions, the policy states that they should be subservient to the scale of the existing roof and should not exceed more than two thirds of the average width of the original roof. Roof extensions should be located below

the ridge tiles of the existing roof and should retain a substantial element of the original roof slope above the eaves line.

- i. The policy also states that the raising of a main roof above the existing ridgeline will generally not be supported. Roof extensions are required to employ appropriate external materials and architectural detailing to match the existing dwelling.
- j. In conservation areas, the policy indicates that roof extensions should take the form of traditional dormer windows and should harmonise with the existing building. The highest point of a dormer should be kept well within the roof slope, away from the ridge, eaves and valleys, and dormer windows should reflect the proportions, size and glazing pattern of the existing windows.
- k. Policy D3 of the London Plan requires development to make the best use of land by following a design-led approach that optimises the capacity of sites. It requires that developments:

"enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportion."

- l. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), adopted on 12 December 2024, sets out the government's national planning policies and how these policies should be applied. It identifies a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Development is sustainable when it meets the economic, social and environmental needs of a community.
- m. According to paragraph 39:

"Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible."

- n. Chapter 11 encourages developers and local planning authorities to *"make effective use of land"*. Part (d) of paragraph 125 promotes *"the development of under-utilised land and buildings"*.

- o. Chapter 12 requires good design. Paragraph 131 describes the *"creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places"* as *"fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve"*.
- p. Paragraph 130 requires that densities be maximised, to *"ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site"*.
- q. According to paragraph 135, developments must *"function well add to the overall quality of the area"*, be *"visually attractive as a result of good architecture"*, be *"sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment"* and provide *"a high standard of amenity for existing and future users"*.
- r. Paragraph 202 states that:

"heritage assets ... are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations"

- s. Paragraph 210 requires that local planning authorities take account of the *"desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation"* as well as *"the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality"*.
- t. According to paragraph 212:

"When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance."

- u. According to paragraph 213:

"Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification."

6. Case for the Appellants

- a. The council does not object in principle to the appeal proposal and it does not believe that there will be any harm to living conditions at neighbouring properties.
- b. It has also raised no objection to the proposed single storey side extension or the part single, part double storey rear extension. The appellants have an extant planning permission for these elements, granted in February 2025 under reference 61421/APP/2024/2854.
- c. The council's sole concern relates to the proposed side dormers and their effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.
- d. The officer's report describes the dormers as *"two large side dormers"* and considers that they would *"erode the simplicity and integrity of the original roof form"*; *"disrupt the continuity of roof slopes"* and result in *"visually intrusive roof alterations"*.
- e. The officer further states that the dwelling forms part of *"a coherent group of mid-20th century dwellings"* with a *"generally uninterrupted side roof slope"*, which is said to create a *"uniform roofscape"* that makes a positive contribution to the conservation area.
- f. The dormers are modest additions to the roof, positioned on the side roof slopes and set below the main ridge line. They are set well back from the front elevation. They are well proportioned and incorporate a hipped roof form which reflects the geometry of the main roof. They do not involve any increase in ridge height and do not alter the footprint of the dwelling.
- g. Works have commenced and the dormer structures are now in place. Figure 1, on page 6 of this report, shows the front elevation of the house with the dormers partially constructed. Even at this stage, they do not project prominently above the roofline or present as dominant features within the street scene.
- h. A closer view is provided in figure 2, below, which shows one of the dormers in detail. This image demonstrates the modest scale of the structure and its position set well back from the street frontage.



Figure 2: Photograph of one of the dormers.

- i. The case officer refers to the "*loss of the hipped roof form*", but the existing hipped roof form would remain legible, with the dormers read as secondary elements within the roofscape rather than as dominant features.
- j. While the dormers would introduce change to the roof, change in itself is not harm. The proposal would retain the essential characteristics of the host dwelling and would not result in the loss of its overall roof form. In the context of a suburban part of the conservation area, where the council has already accepted substantial extensions to the building, the proposed dormers would not appear as incongruous or discordant additions.
- k. That other houses in the immediate area do not have similar dormers does not mean that they are an inappropriate form of development. They are a conventional architectural feature and will integrate well with the character and proportions of the house. They will not appear incongruous or out of place when viewed from the street.
- l. In any case, Almond Avenue has a diverse character and appearance. Although numbers 2, 3, 4 and 5 have similar designs, the other houses are of different designs. A short distance to the west are rows of semi-detached houses, shown in figure 3, below. These houses have a distinctive design incorporating traditional front dormer windows similar in design to the appeal proposal.



Figure 3: Dormers on houses very close to the appeal site.

- m. On the other side of the road from the appeal property, an array of small dormers can be seen clearly from Almond Avenue, located on the rear roofslope of a house at 30 Long Lane, as seen in the image in figure 4, below.



Figure 4: Rear dormers at 30 Long Lane, visible from Almond Avenue.

- n. The appellant's proposed dormers will not, therefore, look out of place in the context of surrounding development.
- o. The appeal site lies within the Ickenham Village Conservation Area. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires decision-makers to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.

- p. National policy requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, and any harm to significance must be clearly and convincingly justified. The council identifies less than substantial harm to the conservation area, in line with paragraph 209 of the NPPF.
- q. The conservation area covers the historic medieval centre of the village, but also part of Ickenham's twentieth-century suburban expansion associated with 'Metroland' growth.
- r. The council has not adopted a formal character appraisal for the area, but a character assessment prepared on behalf of the Ickenham Neighbourhood Forum describes the Metroland area as comprising houses of roughly similar scale and broadly consistent building lines, but with a variety of house designs rather than a single uniform architectural type.
- s. The assessment places particular emphasis on the planned suburban layout, generous plot sizes and the strong green character created by wide verges, front gardens and mature street trees.
- t. In this part of the conservation area, significance therefore derives primarily from the overall townscape qualities of the area and the experience of the street as a green, spacious suburban environment, rather than from the architectural purity of individual houses or the absence of change.
- u. Individual dwellings make a positive contribution as part of a wider group, but that contribution lies in their scale, siting and relationship with the street rather than in unaltered roof forms.
- v. The proposed dormers would not alter the layout of the street, the spacing between buildings, the building line or the green character of the area. They would introduce a modest degree of change to the roof of an individual dwelling, but they would not erode the wider townscape qualities or the group value which underpin the significance of the conservation area in this location. In that context, there is no material harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- w. The appellants note that the council has granted permission for similar side dormers on other houses within the same conservation area. For example, on 24 September 2025, the council approved a side dormer at 32 Milton Court, a short distance from the appeal site (reference: 16332/APP/2025/1821).
- x. In the officer's report for that approval, the case officer judged that:

"Whilst the Council's Conservation Officer raised overlooking concerns regarding the proposed side dormer window, given the proposed side dormer would

be obscure glazed and non-opening below 1.7m from finished floor level, combined with the overall depth and width of the side dormer, and its position within the side roof slope, it is considered that the proposed side dormer would appear as a subordinate addition to the application property. The proposed side dormer would therefore not cause harm to the character and appearance of the application property and would preserve the character and appearance of the surrounding Ickenham Village Conservation Area"

- y. Copies of the decision notice, officer's report and approved plans for this application are provided in the appendices.

7. Conclusions

- a. The council does not object in principle to the appeal proposal, raises no concerns in respect of neighbour amenity, and accepts the proposed single storey side extension and part single, part double storey rear extension, which benefit from an extant planning permission granted in February 2025.
- b. The appeal therefore turns solely on the proposed side dormers. The council's concern is that they would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area by interrupting the side roof slopes and eroding the simplicity of the roof form.
- c. The dormers are modest additions, however. They are set below the main ridge line, well back from the front of the house and occupy a relatively small proportion of the roof as a whole. They do not involve raising the ridge height, do not alter the footprint of the building, and would retain the legibility of the existing hipped roof, with the dormers read as secondary elements rather than dominant features.
- d. The proposed dormers are conventional in form, well-proportioned and designed with a sympathetic hipped roof profile that reflects the character of the main roof. While they would introduce change, change in itself does not amount to harm, and the proposal would retain the essential characteristics of the host dwelling.
- e. The appeal site lies within the Ickenham Village Conservation Area. This part of the conservation area forms part of Ickenham's twentieth-century suburban expansion, where significance derives primarily from the planned layout, consistent scale, generous plots and strong green character, rather than from the architectural purity of individual houses or unaltered roof forms. Individual dwellings make a positive contribution as part of a wider group, but that contribution lies in their scale, siting and relationship with the street.
- f. The proposed dormers would not alter the layout of the street, the spacing between buildings, the building line or the verdant character that defines this part of Ickenham. They would introduce a modest and localised change to the roof of an individual dwelling but would not undermine the wider townscape qualities or group value that underpin the significance of the conservation area.
- g. For these reasons, the appellant contends that the development represents sustainable development, and the inspector is respectfully requested to allow the appeal.



Just Planning Limited
Email: info@just-planning.co.uk

Just Planning HQ
42 Hampstead House
176 Finchley Road
London NW3 6BT

www.just-planning.co.uk

 [justplanning](https://www.facebook.com/justplanning)
 [@JustPlanning](https://twitter.com/JustPlanning)

© Just Planning 2026