



Appeal Statement

Householder Extensions
AT
27 Woodstock Drive,
Ickenham UB10 8EG

Reference:
277KA-1340

Date:
25 February 2021

1. Introduction

- a. This Appeal Statement has been prepared by Just Planning on behalf of Mr R Soraya to support an appeal against the decision of London Borough of Hillingdon to refuse an application to vary conditions attached to planning approval 61790/APP/2018/1659, which was for side and rear extensions to 27 Woodstock Drive, in Ickenham.
- b. Following a description of the site and surrounding area, this report will consider the planning history, provide an overview of relevant planning policy and outline the case for the appellant.
- 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 11 November 2020, the appellant submitted an application to London Borough of Hillingdon for the following proposal (reference: 61790/APP/2020/3684):

Variation of condition Nos. 2 (Approved Plans) and 4 (Windows) of planning application Ref: 61790/APP/2018/1659 dated 24/08/2018 to increase the width of the two storey side extension, amendments to the approved plans and openings and include 2 x single storey front extensions (Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and canopy to front involving demolition of existing garages).

- b. On 12 January 2021, the council refused planning permission for the following reasons:

1. *The proposed two storey side extension, by virtue of its size, scale, bulk, width and design would fail to appear as a subordinate addition and would thus fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original semi-detached dwelling, would be detrimental to the character, appearance and symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses of which it forms a part and to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies.*
2. *The proposed side and front extensions by reason of their siting in a visually prominent location and their projection forward of the main front elevation and design, would represents disproportionate and incongruous additions that fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and the surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).*

3. Site Description

- a. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached house located on the northern side of Woodstock Drive, in the Ickenham area of the borough. It is brick-built with a tiled, hipped roof. It has a front gable projection. It sits on a large plot, with front and rear gardens and, prior to the recent development, had a double garage to the side. There is a vehicle crossover with off-street parking on the frontage. The house is set back 18.5m from the street. Figure 1 provides an image of the building prior to its recent extension.



Figure 1: Image of the appeal property, viewed from the street

- b. The property is one of a row of similar houses along the northern side of Woodstock Drive. They differ somewhat in terms of their detailed design and they do not observe a consistent building line. The houses on the other side of the street are of a different size and architectural design.
- c. The adjoining neighbour at number 25 has extended to the side over two storeys, as shown in the image in figure 2, below. The extension projects close to the boundary with number 23.



Figure 2: Image of the side extension at number 25

- d. A number of the other houses have also extended to the side, including numbers 33 and 35, as shown in the satellite image in figure 3, below. In both cases, the extensions project to the side boundaries. In addition, both extensions project forward at ground floor level.



Figure 3: Satellite image of extensions to number 33 and 35

- e. The building on the application site is not listed and the site is not located within a designated conservation area.

4. Relevant Planning History & Appeal Proposal

- a. In August 2018, the council approved a planning application for the following development (reference: 61790/APP/2018/1659):

Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension and canopy to front involving demolition of existing garages

- b. Condition 2 of this approval is:

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers ZD/2018/27WD-3 B, ZD/2018/27WD-5 C, ZD/2018/27WD-7 C, ZD/2018/27WD-6 B, ZD/2018/27WD-8 Rev.C, ZD/2018/27WD-1 Rev.B.

- c. Condition 4 is:

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional windows, doors or other openings shall be constructed in the walls or roof slopes of the development hereby approved facing 25 or 29 Woodstock Drive.

- d. The approved plans and decision notice are provided in the appendices.
- e. The appellant has sought to implement this approval, but the development, as carried out, does not correspond to the approved plans. The side extension is approximately 1m wider than approved and two single-storey front extensions have been added, one to either side of the main front gable.
- f. The appeal proposal is for the extensions as built. It also proposes minor changes to the windows, cladding of the ground floor front extensions and landscaping, in order to enhance the design and appearance of the completed development.
- g. The images in figure 4, below, compare the front elevations of the development as approved and as proposed.



Figure 4: Comparison of approved (top) and proposed (bottom) (not to scale)

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. The relevant parts of the development plan for the area are the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020).
- b. According to the decision notice, the development fails to comply with policy BE1 of the Strategic Policies and policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Development Management Policies.
- c. Policy BE1 (Built Environment) of the Strategic Policies requires all new development to 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.
- d. Policy DMHB 11 (Design of New Development) of the Development Management Policies 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.
- e. Policy DMHB 12 (Streets and Public Realm) relates to the public realm design and improvements and does not appear to be relevant to the appeal proposal, which is confined to the curtilage of the dwelling only.
- f. 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"

- g. It requires that extensions are subordinate to the host dwelling *"in their floor area, width, depth and height"*. It recommends the use of matching materials. It requires that adequate garden space and parking is retained.

- h. It recommends that two-storey side extensions are set back 1m from the main front elevation and that the ridge of the roof is set 0.5m lower than the ridge of the roof over the main part of the house. Side extensions should be no more than 50% of the width of the main house.

- i. In respect of front extensions, the policy says that:

"The Council will not normally accept front extensions and canopies including extensions linked to garages and porches as these not only affect the character and building itself but also the street scene."

- j. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2019) sets out the government's planning policies for England and how they 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.

- k. Paragraph 11(c) requires that decision-makers approve *"development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay"*. Where policies are absent or out of date, permission should be granted unless:

"any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole."

- l. According to paragraph 38:

"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."

- m. Paragraph 124 states that:

"Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities."

- n. According to paragraph 130:

"...where the design of a development accords with clear expectations in plan policies, design should not be used by the decision-maker as a valid reason to object to development."

6. Case for the Appellant

- a. The Council does not object in principle to the extension of this dwelling and it is satisfied that there will be no harm to the residential amenity of close neighbours. It is concerned about the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the property and wider streetscene.
- b. The appellant has an extant approval for a similar development under 61790/APP/2018/1659, so the main issue in this appeal is whether the changes relative to that approved scheme represent sufficient harm to visual amenities that a refusal of planning permission is justified.
- c. The officer's report points out that the side extension exceeds half the width of the original house and that it is set in less than 1m from the side boundary, contrary to policy DMHD 1 of the Local Plan: Part Two. However, the intention of these specific limits is to deliver good design and to protect the character of the area. In the appellant's view, the development that has been carried out respects and reflects the character of the original house and the surrounding pattern of development.
- d. The extension does not appear cramped since there remains a gap between it and the eastern neighbour at number 29. The fact that this neighbour is set at something of an angle to the appeal property also helps ensure that there is no visual coalescence between the buildings. The fact that the new extension complies with other requirements in DMHD 1 that it be set down, set back and have a sympathetic hipped roof form all help to ensure that the extension appears subordinate and integrates successfully with the design and proportions of the main house. That the house has a fairly simple and unadorned architectural treatment further helps link the two elements and the result is a balanced and harmonious facade, with the front gable roughly centred along the front elevation.
- e. The streetscene in this location is diverse in character and appearance. The building line is uneven and there is variety in architectural treatments. Many of the houses with side gardens have extended into this space. In particular, the new extension balances a similar development recently carried out at number 25, the property's adjoining neighbour. This extension is less than 50% of the width of the main house for the simple reason that the neighbour's side garden is much narrower than the appellant's. The extension nevertheless projects fairly close to the side boundary, as evident from the satellite image in figure 5, below.



Figure 5: Satellite image of the extension at number 25 (on left) and showing the appeal site before the recent development (on right)

- f. In addition, extensions to a similar scale and design have been built at numbers 33 and 35 Woodstock Drive, a short distance to the east of the appeal site. Images of these extensions, viewed from the street, are provided in figures 6 and 7, below. In the appellant's view, the extensions at numbers 25, 33 and 35 are successful additions to the streetscene.



Figure 6: Image of 33 Woodstock Drive



Figure 7: Image of 35 Woodstock Drive

- g. Permission is also sought for single-storey front extensions to the property. The officer's report notes that front extensions are not 'normally' found to be acceptable, because they may have a harmful impact on the streetscene.
- h. However, in this case, the extensions are modest in size, scale and visual impact. They are 2.3m deep and 3.65m high. They are framed by the much larger host building behind, are subordinate additions and do not appear incongruous or out of place.
- i. The front extensions are similar to the extensions at number 33 and 35, shown in figures 6 and 7 above. In both cases, the side extension projects forward at ground floor level and there is a new porch/front extension on the other side of the front gable. The design successfully integrates the various elements of the building and causes no material harm to visual amenities.
- j. The appeal proposal include minor alterations to the development, including new windows, cladding to the ground floor and landscaping, all of which are intended to soften the appearance of the completed development enhance the quality of the design.
- k. The appellant notes that there were no objections to his proposal from neighbours or any other third parties.

7. Conclusions

- a. The council does not object in principle to the appeal proposal and does not believe there will be any harm to neighbours' amenities. It is concerned that the side extension is excessively wide and that the single-storey front extensions also harm the streetscene.
- b. Though wider than was previously approved, the side extension nevertheless relates well to the host building and the wider streetscene. It balances a similar extension at number 25 and does not appear oversized or cramped on the site. It does not cause material harm relative to the approved, narrower proposal.
- c. The single-storey rear extensions are modest in height and projection. They are framed by the main house behind and do not have a harmful impact when viewed from the street. They are not disproportionate additions. They are similar to design elements approved and built at numbers 33 and 35 Woodstock Drive, a short distance from the appeal site.
- d. In general, the streetscene in this location is diverse. The building line is uneven, many of the houses have been extended and there is substantial difference in the appearance of the northern and southern sides of the street. This diversity creates greater tolerance for alterations to individual properties.
- e. For the above reasons, it is considered that the proposed development complies with the relevant development plan and national policies and the inspector is therefore respectfully requested to allow this appeal.



Just Planning Limited

Tel: 020 3488 1525

Email: info@just-planning.co.uk

Just Planning HQ

Suite 45

4 Spring Bridge Road
London W5 2AA

www.just-planning.co.uk

[!\[\]\(11b47853efe756d31c268612c0cc4217_img.jpg\) justplanning](#)

[!\[\]\(9f63f5ec98cc2eddf66038fdc55c1091_img.jpg\) @JustPlanning](#)

© Just Planning 2021