



APPEAL STATEMENT

Consilio

AGAINST THE DECISION OF LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON TO REFUSE
PLANNING PERMISSION FOR:

‘Part single storey/part two storey side and rear extension incorporating roof
alterations’
(REF: 76195/APP/2021/478)

AT: 4 HARVIL ROAD, ICKENHAM, UB10 8AJ

PREPARED BY: HARMEET S MINHAS MRTPI

CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	2
2.0	SITE AND SURROUNDINGS.....	2
3.0	PLANNING HISTORY.....	3
4.0	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT.....	3
5.0	PLANNING POLICY.....	4
6.0	PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS.....	6
7.0	CONCLUSION.....	11

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 These Grounds of Appeal have been submitted in support of an appeal against London Borough of Hillingdon's decision to refuse planning permission for **'Part single storey/part two storey side and rear extension incorporating roof alterations'**, at **4 Harvil Road, Ickenham, UB10 8AJ**, (Ref 76195/APP/2021/478).
- 1.2 The Council's decision notice cited one reason for refusal, as:
- **The proposed part single storey/part two storey side extension, by virtue of its siting, size, scale, bulk, and design, including the lack of a set back from the front at all levels, would fail to appear as a subordinate addition and would thus be detrimental to the appearance of the original house, the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the wider area. The proposal is therefore 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 (Jan 2020)**
 - **The proposed widening of the existing vehicle access would exacerbate existing highway conditions and would result in conditions prejudicial and detrimental to the amenity of pedestrians, contrary to policies DMT2 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan; Part Two- Development Management Policies (Jan 2020).**
- 1.3 As is the appellant's prerogative, this appeal is submitted under Section 78 (Section 2) of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990).
- 1.4 Within this appeal submission, we will address the reason for refusal and issues raised by the Council in the Officer's report. We identify the following key issues for consideration in this appeal are:
- Whether the proposal by virtue of its design would be detrimental to the appearance of the dwelling, or the character and appearance of the wider area.
 - Whether the proposed widening of the existing vehicular access would be prejudicial to the highway network and/or pedestrians

2.0 APPEAL SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The appeal site is located on the western side of Harvil Road, set within the predominant residential envelope of development of the western side of the street. The appeal dwelling is two-storey in nature with a part hipped, part dutch-hip roof profile. The dwelling is constructed of a mix of yellow brick and red hung tiles at first

floor level. To the north of the original dwelling is a garage extension with a dummy pitched roof.

- 2.2 The immediate area is made up of two storey dwellings of varying architectural types. The varying architectural type of the dwellings appears to represent the evolution of development within the immediate area as a result of recent extensions/alterations, as well as roof alterations. Plots within the immediate setting are characterised by their open frontages with soft landscaping features along their respective front and flank boundaries.
- 2.3 An analysis of the street scene demonstrates the harmony of these varying architectural types and roof profiles, with a mix of hipped and gable roofs. In particular instances more modest dwellings benefit from front and rear dormer windows, whilst other two-storey dwellings benefit from traditional fenestration arrangements. The varying range of design is supported by a mix of materials including yellow brick, render and tile hung features.
- 2.4 As a result of its architectural mix Harvil Road evidently has no prevailing character. This is notable in the varying design of properties, their respective heights, and the ability of dwellings of such a mix to complement one another within their immediate setting. Harvil Road's wider character is supported by the individual design of each property as well as its landscaping features which cumulatively contribute to its suburban setting.
- 2.5 The site falls within the residential area as identified in the Hillingdon Local Plan. The site is not located within the Conservation Area, nor is the dwelling locally or statutorily listed.

3.0 PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 The application site does not benefit from any relevant planning applications on the Council's online portal.

4.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 4.1 This appeal seeks planning permission for the alteration and extension of the dwelling including part single storey, part two storey side and rear extensions. In addition, an extension to the existing vehicular access is sought although it is noted that this has been omitted from the description on the decision notice, by the Local Planning Authority.

- 4.2 The proposed two-storey rear extension measures 4m in depth and extends the full width of the original dwelling, connecting to the proposed two-storey side extension. The two-storey side aspect would replace the existing garage and would be located wholly within the envelope of the existing footprint of the garage ensuring the extension is not drawn further towards the boundary with No.5 Harvil Road. In doing so, the design ensures a sufficient visual gap remains between both dwellings as well as achieving a subordinate design and roof profile against the main building.
- 4.3 As part of the proposed works the appellant seeks the reconstruction of the existing roof profile. Owing to the nature of the existing roof profile the two-storey side extension did not lend itself architecturally to the host building. In seeking to achieve a harmonious form of design with the existing roof profile the resultant design was comprised and contrived. It was then considered by the appellant that the introduction of traditional roof form would harmonise with the prevailing character of the area but also allow the side and rear extensions to appear subordinate to the rest of the building.
- 4.4 The proposed extension to the vehicular access would increase the width of the existing access by 1.2m, when compared to the existing arrangement. The appellant seeks the widening of the existing access to provide a safer arrangement when entering and exiting the site. As you travel north along Harvil Road the existing access, by virtue of its width, provides a challenging turn into the site. The appellant often finds that the need to enter the site using the existing access requires them to go 'wider' meaning in some cases they have to cross the central white line. The proposal will allow vehicles to draw into and exit the site in a more gradual manner that would in their opinion enhance highway safety.

5.0 PLANNING POLICY

National Planning Policy

- 5.1 The Government published the revised National Planning Policy Framework in 2019. The NPPF which is the overarching planning document in England, continues to seek to secure positive growth in a way that effectively balances economic, environmental, and social progress for this and future generations.
- 5.2 The NPPF (2019) attaches importance to the design of the built environment, which is seen as a key aspect of sustainable development, indivisible from good planning, that should contribute positively to making places better for people.

5.3 Chapter 12 of the NPPF (2019) reiterates that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. It then states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments.

- Will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development.
- Are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout, and appropriate and effective landscaping.
- Are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities).
- Establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming, and distinctive places to live work and visit.
- Optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and
- Create places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

Local Planning Policy

5.4 Sitting underneath the NPPF is the London Plan (2021), The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2020), The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020) and Supplementary Planning Documents.

London Plan (2021)

- D6 - Housing quality and standards
- SI2 - Minimising greenhouse gas emissions
- T6 - Car parking

Development Management Policies

- PT1.BE1 – (2012) Built Environment
- DMHD 1 – Alterations and extensions to residential dwellings
- DMHB 11 – Design of New Development
- DMHB 12 – High buildings and structures
- DMT 2 – Highways Impact
- DMT 6 – Vehicle Parking

The above documents are, therefore, material considerations in the determination of this appeal.

6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Reason for Refusal One

- 6.1 The Councils reason for refusal stems around the design and appearance of the proposed extensions when viewed in hand with the original dwelling, as well as the wider setting. The concerns specifically listed in the decision notice refer to the set back from the front at all levels of the two-storey side aspect. Other concerns highlighted in regard to the design and appearance of the extensions relate to the roof alterations, notably the roof profile.
- 6.2 Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (Jan 2020) state that planning applications relating to alterations and extensions of dwellings should ensure, amongst other factors, that there is no adverse cumulative impact on the proposal on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area as well as a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings.
- 6.3 The officer's report states that the absence of a set-back from the ground floor part of the two-storey extension would be contrary to policy. The absence of a set-back at ground floor level is in itself not considered to be detrimental to the appearance of the resultant dwelling. The small-scale width of the extension coupled with its set-

back at first floor from the principal elevation and main ridge height would ensure a subordinate form of development that would not detract from the prevailing design of the property.

- 6.4 Dwellings within the immediate vicinity, notably to the north of the appeal site and the entrance of Highfield Drive, benefit from two-storey side extensions. In some instances, the extensions are built flush with the main dwelling whilst others only set-back the first floor. The appellants design has given significant weighting to the established character, notably the existing extensions which exist. In doing so, the appeal proposal has provided a scheme that complements the setting and would not appear to dominate the main body of the building. Whilst the Council's desire for a set-back at all levels is noted, it is evident that this is not the only way to achieve a scheme that would be compliant with overarching aims of Policy DMHD 1 of the Local Plan.
- 6.5 Having regard to the existing arrangement the existing garage is set forward of the main building. Should the appellant have applied for a first-floor extension only, guidance would have allowed for the set back of the upper floor only. The resultant appearance would have been more harmful to that which is sought under this appeal. It is considered that the Council have not given sufficient weight to this proposition.
- 6.6 In addition, concern has been raised by Council officers with relation to the proposed roof alterations. As previously touched upon the appellant seeks the alteration of the main roof profile to incorporate a traditional hip. This is owing to the challenge and difficulty in amalgamating the roof profile of the side extension into the main roof, with its part dutch-hip.
- 6.7 The appellant considers that the Council in reaching their decision have attributed to greater weight to the roof profile. The roof profile is predominantly hipped in nature on all sides with the highest point then interlocking into the dutch-hip. The existing roof is the only such example within Harvil Road or neighbouring streets. The importance of this original roof profile has not been adequately justified within the report by the LPA. Nonetheless, its loss would not be as harmful to the setting as suggested which we will demonstrate.
- 6.8 The architecture and roof profiles along Harvil Road are agreed to be varied, to a degree that there is no common theme. The appeal scheme seeks to introduce a traditional roof form, a hipped roof, to the main body of the building. The hipped nature of the four sides would be akin to the existing arrangement with the only notable alteration being the roof apex meeting at a point. When viewed between the neighbouring properties which have gable-end roofs, the resultant dwelling would not appear at odds with the immediate setting, or wider character. It would represent a roof profile evident elsewhere in the street scene and surrounding roads such as

Highfield Drive. As such, its presence would be complimentary to the setting ensuring the dwelling would nestle well within Harvil Road.

Reason for Refusal Two

- 6.9 The Council's second for refusal relates to the widening of the existing vehicular access at the site. As part of the application, the Council consulted their highways department who raised objections to the proposal owing to the proposed width of the access.
- 6.10 It is worth highlighting prior to laying out the appellants comments, that the highways officer raises objections based on a technical analysis of their policy and has not had regard to site specifics prior to determining the impact as well as need of the widening.
- 6.11 The existing entrance into the driveway of No.4 Harvil Road is 2.4m and the vehicular access is 4.4m. The photos below show a perspective of the owners/occupiers when leaving the site during the day. The photos demonstrate that there is limited to zero visibility of pedestrians and highway users. Even where it is possible to exit in forward gear, vehicles have to creep and draw **on to** the road to have adequate splays.



Photo 1: Existing vehicular access



Photo 2: Perspective of access from vehicle

- 6.12 As previously touched upon, the existing access creates a narrow pinch point and offers limited visibility when exiting the site. In addition, the width of the existing access does not allow a gradual turn into the site but a more forced angular access. This requires the applicant to slow to a speed whilst carrying out a wider turning manoeuvre into the site on what is a busy connection road which is used by commercial vehicles, private vehicles and more recently HS2 vehicles.
- 6.13 As part of the appellants grounds, they have given consideration to the neighbouring vehicular accesses and have carried out measurements of each access for the benefit of the Inspector.
- 6.14 Photo 3 below is of the neighbouring property No.5 Harvil Road, which benefit from 2 vehicular accesses into and out of the site. The access nearest the appeal site has a width of 6.1m and to the north, 5.5m. Both accesses allow the owners/occupiers adequate visibility leaving the site as well as a more proficient turning point into the site. It is evident that this arrangement provides less risk to highway users, and pedestrians.



Photo 3: 5 Harvil Road

- 6.15 Photo 4 below shows the existing arrangement at No.6 Harvil Road, where the vehicular access is in excess of 5.8m. The Inspector will note it is evident that the difference between this access and that in-situ at No.4 is considerable, whilst highlighting the highway safety issues that exist and will continue if the access is not widened.



Photo 4: 6 Harvil Road

- 6.16 Photo 5 below shows the existing vehicular access at No.16 Harvil Road which is over 7.5m. This is over 3m in excess of the policy note cited in the Council's comments.



Photo 5: 16 Harvil Road

- 6.17 It is worth highlighting that the other examples shown are within the same speed zone as the appeal site. The appeal site is in a more challenging location owing to its proximity to the Swakeleys Road roundabout, when compared to the other properties.
- 6.18 The above examples have not only highlighting inconsistencies in the way the Council applies their policies but more importantly a failure to consider the highway arrangements and live consideration of the road. The highways officer has at no point in their comments considered the location of the site, the speed of the road, its proximity to a roundabout, or the nature of users of Harvil Road in the wider network. All such matters have led to the genuine need for a wider access to protect highway users, pedestrians, and the appellants themselves.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 It is therefore concluded, in respect of these issues raised, that the proposed development would be of a design and layout that would harmonise with the character of the existing dwelling, as well as the wider setting.
- 7.2 The proposed increase in the vehicular access is reasonably required to facilitate the safe manoeuvring of vehicles to and from the site. The existing access at less than 4.3m wide allows for a pinch point of approx. 2.6m between the edge of the front boundary hedge and the brick wall, along the shared boundary with No.5 Harvil Road. The increase of the vehicular access would contribute towards a betterment of highway and pedestrian safety within and adjacent the site, increasing visibility splays and the turning point as you travel from the south along Harvil Road.
- 7.3 Overall, the proposal satisfies the context of the NPPF, the London Plan, Development Management Policies and supporting Supplementary Planning Documents.

- 7.4 In light of the above, we respectfully request the Inspector allows the appeal, subject to any planning conditions they considered appropriate to the development.