



UXBRIDGE DESIGN & DETAILING SERVICES Ltd

THE OLD BAKERY, 21B WINDSOR STREET
UXBRIDGE, MIDDLESEX, UB8 1AB

TEL: (01895) 255791
E-MAIL: info@uxbridgedesign.co.uk

DIRECTOR: DAVID P. WEBB I.Eng.A.M.I.Stuct.E

APPEAL AGAINST REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION

At

62 THE DRIVE, ICKENHAM, UXBRIDGE, UB10 8AQ.

For

**SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION, FIRST FLOOR REAR EXTENSION AND
CONVERSION OF ROOF SPACE TO HABITABLE USE, TO INCLUDE REAR
DORMER AND 6 x FRONT ROOF LIGHTS.**

This appeal is against the refusal to grant planning Consent for the single storey front extension, first floor rear extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use to include rear dormer and 6 front roof lights.

The application was refused by London Borough of Hillingdon on 8 August 2018 under their reference no. 38634/APP/2018/20841.

The reason for the refusal was that in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed extension to the property would, 'by reason of the design, size, scale and bulk would represent an unduly intrusive and incongruous form of development, detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing and adjoining properties and the visual amenities of the street scene and wider area'.

Planning History

A previous Planning application was made on this property of a similar extension.

It was registered by Hillingdon Council 15th August 2016 and given the reference no. 38634/APP/2016/2981. This application was refused consent on 24th April 2017 and the reason for the refusal was similar to the current application being appealed.

This earlier application was also appealed on 10th July 2017 and given reference no. APP/R5510/D/17/3179741. The Planning Inspectorate overturned the Council decision and granted consent on 27th November 2017.

The Drive is a road of mainly large detached dwellings all of differing designs, styles and character.

Over the years many of the dwellings have had significant extensions and loft conversions, and a number have also been demolished and replaced by larger dwellings. Each dwelling is unique with its own character and materials used for the properties range greatly.

The design of the existing dwelling is that of a two storey house with the main section being a front to rear pitched tiled roof with gable ends to the flank walls. To the centre of the property there is a projecting front section with a gabled roof which runs back into the main roof structure. This projection accommodates the main entrance to the property.

To the left side at the roof there is a single storey section with a pitched 'lean to' roof which accommodates the garage entrance.

To the rear of the property there is a single storey section which we believe to be a previous extension across the width of the majority of the property. To the rear left side of this dwelling, when viewed from the front there is a two gabled ended section, beyond which there is a predominately glazed Conservatory.

The first part of the proposal, which is the only element that would significantly affect the 'street scene' is that of a small single storey front addition to the right side of the central projecting gable, this is identical to that granted consent on the previous appeal. This extension would be only 5.05m wide x 2.3m deep with a pitched 'lean to' tiled roof. The design of this addition is similar to that on the left side thus balancing the appearance of the front of the property.

This element of the application is considered to be acceptable as it would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the subject property and the wider area.'

The second element is the installation of the Velux style windows to the roof structure, both front and rear. In the Case Officers report they state that, 'the proposed windows will face front and rear as per the existing layout so would not result in an increased loss of privacy. As such the proposal is in compliance with Policy BE24...'

With regards to the first floor extension, this is to be located to the centre rear elevation of the existing dwelling so cannot be seen for the street. The Case Officers report states that in

terms of design it is similar to the previously approved scheme and is considered acceptable.

The width of the proposed first floor extension shown on this application is slightly wider than that previously approved, however the details Daylight and Sunlight Report prepared by MES building solutions (attached to this appeal) clearly show that the construction of this extension would not have any significant lighting effect on the neighbouring property.

This report was submitted to the local Planning Authority as part of the revised application.

Therefore we believe comments relating to impact on the neighbouring property are no longer valid.

There are a number of new and extended dwellings nearby, some overlooking this property, that have crown roofs, including those below;

- 1). 64 The Drive, an extended property with a crown roof.
Planning ref. 51429/APP/2012/2694 granted 7/01/2013
- 2). 56 The Drive, new dwelling with crown roof,
Planning ref. 4496/APP/2009/2765, granted 22/02/2011.
- 3). Land of 2 Highfield Drive, new dwelling with crown roof.
Planning ref. 65653/APP/2016/531 granted 3/05/2016
- 4). 1 Highfield Drive, an extended property with a crown roof.
Planning ref. 6653/APP/2016/967, granted 16/08/2016.

There are numerous more properties, particularly in The Drive that have a crown roof.

As the previous appeal was granted for the property with a crown roof, then we believe little has changed with the principles of this design proposal.

This application was refused on the ground it would be contrary to policies BE19 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2. (November 2012) and the Supplementary Planning Document HDAS, Residential Extensions.

The Case Officer's report already agrees that the proposed front extension and installation of the roof windows would not detract from the character of the original dwelling, therefore we believe the proposed design meets the requirement of this policy.

BE19 states that new development complements or improves the amenity and character of the area.

This is achieved for the reasons states above. The character of the area is that of detached houses of varying design so we believe that the character of the individual house is the important factor for this proposal.

BE21 states that permission will not be granted for extensions which by reason of their siting, bulk and proximity, would result in a significant loss of residential amenity.

The extension is to the first floor of a current rear addition so the will be no further loss to the residential amenity of the application dwelling.

The Day light and Sun light report attached to this appeal covers the issues of possible light reduction to the neighbouring property.

For the reasons stated above, we believe that the proposals meet there relevant polices and that consent should be granted.



Plan view of 62 The Drive. (This plan also shows crown roof's on 64 The Drive and 1 Highfield Drive).



Existing House - 62 The Drive.



Extended house with crown roof – 64 The Drive.



Extended house with crown roof – 1 Highfield Drive.