



APPEAL STATEMENT

100 Long Lane, Ickenham UB10 8SU

Reference: 100LL-2971-AS

14 July 2026

Introduction

1. This Appeal Statement has been prepared by Just Planning on behalf of Mr Baljit Gill to support an appeal against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon to refuse planning permission for an outbuilding at 100 Long Lane, in Ickenham.
2. On 3 March 2026, the appellant submitted an application to the council under reference 54716/APP/2026/479 for the following development:

Erection of outbuilding to front garden, following demolition of existing outbuilding.

3. On 7 July 2026, the council notified the appellant that the application had been refused for the following reason:

The proposed outbuilding, by reason of its excessive size, bulk, massing and prominent siting within the front/side curtilage of this prominent corner plot, would appear as an unduly dominant and disproportionate form of development that would fail to remain subordinate to the host dwelling. The development would erode the open and spacious character of the site, be visually intrusive within the street scene, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ickenham Village Conservation Area, resulting in less than substantial harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset. The limited public benefits associated with the proposal would not outweigh the identified heritage harm. The proposal is therefore contrary to Sections 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, paragraphs 135, 212 and 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), Policies D3, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021), Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part One (2012), and Policies DMHB 1, DMHB 4, DMHB 11 and DMHD 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two (2020).

4. The application was accompanied by a detailed Planning and Heritage Statement, reference 100LL-2971, dated 5 February 2026. The statement describes the site and surrounding area, explains the proposal and planning history, sets out the relevant planning policies and assesses the proposal's effect on the character and appearance of the area and the Ickenham Village Conservation Area.
5. This Appeal Statement should be read alongside the Planning and Heritage Statement. It does not repeat the appellant's case in full but responds to the reason for refusal and the assessment contained in the officer's report.

Matters not in dispute

6. The council does not object to the principle of replacing the existing outbuilding. Indeed, on 26 November 2025 it granted planning permission under reference 54716/APP/2025/2494 for a new outbuilding in the same part of the site.
7. The approved outbuilding measures 8.5m by 4m and has a footprint of 34sqm. The appeal proposal retains the same width and general position but increases its depth by 1m, producing a footprint of 42.5sqm. The increase in height is limited, and the building would again be excavated into the site by approximately 0.5m.
8. The approved and appeal schemes therefore share the same basic characteristics. Both replace the existing outbuilding, occupy the same general corner of the site, are single-storey domestic outbuildings, are set below the existing ground level, have shallow dual-pitched roofs, are screened by the existing 1.8m boundary fence and are ancillary to the use of the main house.
9. The sole reason for refusal concerns the size and appearance of the building and its effect on the conservation area. The council does not allege any harm to neighbours' living conditions, highway safety, parking provision, garden space or trees. It also accepts that matters relating to excavation, foundations and structural integrity are not material planning considerations.
10. Although a neighbour expressed concern about possible independent residential use, the submitted plans show only a games room and storage space. They do not show a kitchen, bathroom or sleeping accommodation. Any planning permission could, in any event, include a condition requiring the building to remain ancillary to the main house.

The extant permission

11. The extant permission is a material consideration. It establishes that the principle of a replacement outbuilding in this part of the site is acceptable and that a building can be accommodated without harming the character or appearance of the conservation area.
12. The officer's report describes the approved scheme as being at the "*upper limit of acceptability*". That description did not form part of the earlier decision and does not identify any policy standard or objective measure that was supposedly reached. The fact

is that the council granted planning permission and concluded that the approved development was acceptable.

13. There has been no relevant change to the site, its surroundings, the conservation area or the development plan since that permission was granted. The question is therefore whether the limited differences between the two schemes produce the degree of harm alleged in the reason for refusal.
14. The officer's report concentrates on the numerical increase in footprint but gives insufficient consideration to how the development would actually be experienced. A building may be larger on plan without appearing materially larger from the public realm. In this case, the additional floorspace is achieved principally by increasing the depth of a low, screened structure by 1m.
15. The approved outbuilding remains a realistic fallback development. The permission is extant and there is no reason to doubt that it could be implemented. The appeal proposal should therefore be assessed against the likely effects of the approved scheme rather than against an entirely open and undeveloped site.

Scale and subordination

16. The appeal building would remain subordinate to the house. The main house is a substantial two-storey detached dwelling with a prominent hipped roof, front gable and bay windows. The outbuilding would be single-storey, considerably lower and clearly separated from it.
17. Subordination is not determined simply by comparing floor areas. The difference in height, scale, architectural role and position means that the outbuilding would continue to be read as an ancillary garden building rather than as a competing element.
18. The building would occupy only a limited part of the extensive front and side garden. A large open area would remain between it and the house and along the Long Lane frontage. It would not result in the plot appearing cramped or overdeveloped.
19. The officer's report states that the building would be disproportionate to both the house and its curtilage but does not support this conclusion with any calculation, comparison or analysis of the amount of garden that would remain. The use of terms such as "*excessive*", "*dominant*" and "*disproportionate*" does not establish harm without reference to the actual physical and visual relationships at the site.

Siting and visibility

20. The reason for refusal describes the outbuilding's siting as prominent. However, an outbuilding already occupies this part of the site and the council has recently approved its replacement with a larger structure. The location itself has therefore been accepted.

21. The appeal building would be screened from Swakeleys Drive by the existing 1.8m-tall close-boarded fence. It would also be set approximately 0.5m below the existing ground level. These features considerably reduce its apparent height from the street.
22. Only the upper part of the roof would be visible above the fence. The walls and openings would face into the site rather than towards the public realm. The building would not therefore be seen as a complete and freestanding structure from Swakeleys Drive.
23. The comparison drawings reproduced in figure 4 of the Planning and Heritage Statement show very little difference between the approved and appeal schemes as they would be experienced from Swakeleys Drive. The slightly greater depth and height would not translate into a proportionate increase in visual prominence.
24. The officer's report acknowledges the screening provided by the boundary fence and the excavation proposed. Nevertheless, it reaches a conclusion about "*increased visibility*" without identifying any public viewpoint from which the increase would be significant.
25. The appellant accepts that the roof of the appeal building would be somewhat more visible than that of the approved scheme. That does not mean that the structure would become visually intrusive. The relevant question is the degree of change, which would be modest and would remain substantially contained behind the existing boundary treatment.

Openness and the character of the plot

26. The site is unusual because the house is positioned on a triangular corner plot, with its principal garden extending to its front and side. This explains why an ancillary building is located in a position that might, on a conventional rectangular plot, be described as a front garden.
27. The proposal would not fundamentally alter the established arrangement of the site. There is already an outbuilding in this location and a larger replacement has already been approved. The appeal proposal would therefore represent an incremental change rather than the introduction of built development into an entirely open frontage.
28. The outbuilding would remain concentrated close to the northern boundary, leaving the principal open area in front of the house unaffected. The visual separation between the house and the street would remain generous, and the house would continue to sit within a spacious garden setting.
29. The officer's report does not explain which important view or spatial relationship would be lost. The additional 1m of depth would not extend the building materially further into the central part of the garden and would not interrupt views of the main house from Long Lane.
30. The reason for refusal therefore overstates the effect on the open and spacious character of the plot. There would be some additional built form compared with the approved

scheme, but the essential spaciousness and landscaped character of the site would remain.

Design and materials

31. The building has a straightforward domestic design. Its shallow dual-pitched roof reflects traditional ancillary buildings, while the brick walls and tiled roof would relate directly to the materials of the main house and the wider suburban area.
32. The council's conservation and design officer commented on an inconsistency between the colouring of the elevations and the written annotations. The written specification, however, makes clear that the walls would be brickwork and the roof would be tiled to match the house.
33. The case officer expressly accepts that the detailed materials could be secured by condition. They do not therefore provide a reason to refuse planning permission.
34. The change from the sedum roof of the approved scheme to a tiled roof is not harmful. Since the roof would be the principal part of the structure visible above the fence, matching tiles would help the building relate to the established domestic character of the house and surrounding development.

Ickenham Village Conservation Area

35. The appeal site lies close to the southern boundary of the Ickenham Village Conservation Area. It is not within the historic core of Ickenham and is not closely related to any listed building or other principal heritage feature.
36. The immediate surroundings have a suburban residential character. They comprise detached and semi-detached houses in varied designs, many of which have been altered or extended. The significance of the conservation area does not depend on the appeal site remaining entirely free of ancillary development.
37. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. Preservation does not require the prevention of all change. A proposal preserves a conservation area where it causes no harm to the qualities from which its significance is derived.
38. In granting the extant permission, the council necessarily concluded that an outbuilding in this position, of broadly comparable scale and appearance, would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.
39. The officer's report does not identify any particular element of the conservation area's significance that would be harmed by the additional depth and limited increase in height. Instead, it moves from a finding that the structure would be larger and more visible to a general conclusion of heritage harm.

40. Greater visibility does not automatically amount to harm. The building would remain substantially screened, would be finished in appropriate domestic materials and would occupy a location where an outbuilding already exists and where a larger replacement has recently been approved.
41. The proposal would not affect the historic street pattern, the architectural character of any important building, any significant view or the setting of a listed building. It would not alter the relationship between the main house and the street or undermine the suburban, landscaped character of this edge of the conservation area.
42. The proposed development would therefore preserve the character and appearance of the Ickenham Village Conservation Area. It would cause no harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset and would satisfy the statutory duty under section 72(1).

Conclusion

43. The council has already approved the replacement of the existing outbuilding with a larger structure in the same part of the site. The appeal proposal retains the same basic siting, domestic function, low-profile form, excavation and boundary screening.
44. The principal difference is an additional 1m of depth, together with a limited increase in height and the use of a tiled roof. Those changes do not justify the conclusion that the building would become unduly dominant, disproportionate or visually intrusive.
45. The outbuilding would remain subordinate to the substantial two-storey house. It would occupy a limited part of its generous curtilage, remain substantially screened from the street and leave the central part of the garden open.
46. The officer's report relies heavily on general descriptions of excessive bulk and increased prominence but does not demonstrate how the modest differences from the approved scheme would cause material harm.
47. The proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Ickenham Village Conservation Area and comply with the relevant design and heritage policies of the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
48. The inspector is therefore respectfully requested to allow the appeal and grant planning permission, subject to any conditions considered necessary.

Martin Gaine MA (Oxf), MSc (R'dg), MRTPI

Chartered Town Planner

Just Planning Limited

martin@just-planning.co.uk