

APPEAL STATEMENT

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Appeal Against Non-Determination

Appellant: James Tupman

Application Reference: 79176/APP/2025/2905

Site Address: 34 Pepys Close, Ickenham

Local Planning Authority: London Borough of Hillingdon

Statutory Determination Date: 15 January 2026

1. Introduction

This statement accompanies an appeal against the non-determination of planning application 79176/APP/2025/2905 by the London Borough of Hillingdon.

The application relates to alterations and extensions to the property at 34 Pepys Close, Ickenham, which is located within the Ickenham Conservation Area.

The statutory period for determination expired on 15 January 2026, however no formal decision notice has been issued by the Local Planning Authority.

2. Lack of Determination and Communication

Despite the expiry of the statutory determination period, the Local Planning Authority has not issued a formal decision on the application.

The only communication received from the Council was an email from the assigned case officer, Christopher Lamb, dated 3 February 2026, which provided informal feedback on the proposal.

In this email, the officer stated that the proposal could not be supported due to concerns relating to:

- The prominence of the proposed extension

- The use of a hipped roof form

- The perceived impact on the character of the Conservation Area

However, despite these comments being provided, no formal decision notice has been issued.

The officer's email also suggested that the applicant would be free to appeal the Council's decision should they wish to do so, despite the fact that no formal decision had been issued.

The absence of a formal determination and the lack of further engagement has resulted in unnecessary delay and uncertainty for the applicant, leaving no alternative but to pursue an appeal on the grounds of non-determination.

3. Design and Roof Form

A concern raised in the officer's correspondence relates to the use of a hipped roof, which was suggested to conflict with the character of the immediate street scene.

Whilst the immediately neighbouring houses may display different roof forms, this observation does not reflect the wider architectural character of the area.

Within Pepys Close and the wider Ickenham Conservation Area, there exists a variety of roof styles, including:

Flat roofs

Jerkinhead roofs

Gabled roofs

Hipped roofs

Combinations of gable and hip roof forms

This variety contributes to the established architectural character of the Conservation Area.

The presence of different roof styles can also be demonstrated by nearby examples within the Conservation Area:

23 Milton Road – A single-storey structure with a hipped roof positioned directly onto the pavement, demonstrating that hipped roof forms already exist in prominent roadside positions.

14 Milton Road – A property that includes a two-storey hip roof extension approximately 3 metres from the pavement, demonstrating the use of combined gable and hip roof forms, and also a flat roof structure extending to the property boundary.

42 Long Lane – A two-storey with a hipped roof located approximately 1 metre from the pavement.

All of the above properties are located within the Ickenham Conservation Area and demonstrate that a mix of roof styles and extensions positioned close to the pavement already exist within the established character of the area.

When considered within this broader context, the proposed roof design reflects the range of architectural forms already present within the Conservation Area and should not be considered incongruous.

4. Prominence and Scale of the Extension

It has been suggested that the extension would appear overly prominent within the street scene.

However, the proposed revision results in a height increase of less than one metre compared with the previous proposal.

In addition, the use of a hipped roof significantly reduces the perceived bulk and visual impact of the extension when viewed from the street.

The design therefore mitigates the appearance of massing and reduces prominence, resulting in a development that remains proportionate to the scale of the host dwelling.

5. Integration with the Existing Dwelling

The proposal seeks to improve the relationship between the existing side structure (currently functioning as a garage) and the main dwelling.

The revised design allows the side element to be integrated more cohesively with the main house, resulting in a more balanced and unified architectural appearance.

In the appellant's view, the design represents a logical and well-considered evolution of the existing property, improving the overall visual coherence of the building.

It is also considered that had this configuration been included within the original development design by the house builders, it would likely have been accepted as part of the standard architectural form of the dwelling.

6. Split Decision Request

In the event that the Inspector finds either the two-storey side extension or the dormer element acceptable in isolation, the appellant respectfully requests that the Inspector consider issuing a split decision.

Both the two-storey extension and the dormer are capable of being severed from the remainder of the development, and therefore could reasonably be considered independently if necessary.

Furthermore, if the Inspector considers that the principle and scale of the extension are acceptable but has concerns regarding the specific roof design, the applicant would be willing to amend the roof style as directed by the Inspector. The applicants are therefore open to a decision which approves the extension subject to a revised roof form if considered necessary.

7. Conclusion

The Local Planning Authority has failed to determine the application within the statutory timeframe and has not issued a formal decision notice.

The only communication received was informal feedback from the case officer, which does not constitute a formal determination.

For the reasons outlined above, the appellant respectfully requests that the Planning Inspectorate determine the appeal and grant planning permission for the proposed development.

James Tupman
Appellant

Inc images in support

1. Varied roof styles of Pepys Close.



2. 23 Milton Road

3. 42 Long Lane



4. 14 Milton Road

