



APPEAL STATEMENT

Consilio

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

‘Erection of a single storey side and rear extension and erection of a front
extension (amendment to 19355/APP/2021/4485).
(REF: 19355/APP/2022/1063)

AT: 11 The Greenway, Ickenham, UB10 8LS

PREPARED BY: HARMEET S MINHAS MRTPI

CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	2
2.0	SITE AND SURROUNDINGS.....	3
3.0	PLANNING HISTORY.....	4
4.0	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT.....	4
5.0	PLANNING POLICY.....	5
6.0	PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS.....	7
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 the **'Erection of a single storey side and rear extension and erection of a front extension (amendment to 19355/APP/2021/4485)**, at 11 The Greenway, Ickenham, UB10 8LS.

1.2 The Council's decision notice cited one reason for refusal, as:

- *Due to its width, height, bulk and design the proposed front extension would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, subsequently it would be significantly harmful to the appearance of the original dwelling. Additionally the porch would unbalance the visual symmetry which exists between No.11 and No.15 Greenway causing harm to the character and appearance of the area. For these reasons the proposal conflicts with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHD 1, DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 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).

Key Matters

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 proposed front extension would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, and harm its appearance as well as the wider area.

2.0 APPEAL SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The appeal site is located on the western side of The Greenway, Ickenham. The dwelling is characterised by its largely symmetrical appearance with gable roof profiles and matching materials. Its appearance is simple and does not offer any degree of architectural value to the setting, with rather bland detailing.

2.2 Dwellings within the vicinity are a large mix of architectural types with varying uses of roof profiles, materials and general fenestration arrangement. This is largely due to the period in which the properties were constructed with a number of infill

development occurring post-war within the street. This variety and mix of dwelling types contributes to the character of the area and is its prevailing form and type.

- 2.3 An assessment of the street scene identifies a number of front extensions within this part of The Greenway, of varying styles and proportions which have in some cases appear subordinate but in others consume and significantly alter the appearance of the property. These photos form part of Appendix A of the associated appendices.
- 2.4 The general pattern of development with in the area is further characterised by the good-sized open frontages with landscaping features to the front of the respective dwellings. This is more readily apparent on the side of the appeal plot and along with the individuality of dwellings forms part of the vernacular of the road.
- 2.5 The site falls within the developed area as identified in the local development plan. The site is not within a Conservation Area or statutorily or locally listed.

3.0 PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 The appeal site benefits from limited relevant planning history. The Council recently approved a similar scheme at the site with a front porch which is set out in Appendix B for the Inspectors ease.
- 19355/APP/2021/4485 - Erection of a single storey side and rear extension and erection of a front extension (Approved)

4.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 4.1 The appeal proposal seeks to vary an extant permission for the erection of a single storey side/rear extension and a front extension.
- 4.2 Under the previously approved scheme the front extension took the form of a front porch. Subsequently having carried out a character appraisal of the vicinity and a well-formed design the appellant resubmitted a scheme which created a wider front extension. The canopy style projection of the design would allow for the enlargement of the front habitable room.
- 4.3 For the avoidance of any doubt the side and rear aspect of the proposal remained as per the previously approved plans and has not formed or been identified as being a concern for the Council under the current appeal proposal.

5.0 PLANNING POLICY

National Planning Policy

- 5.1 The Government published the revised National Planning Policy Framework in 2021. 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 (2021) 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 (2021) 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), Development Management Policies Part One (2012) and Part Two (2021), and Supplementary Planning Documents.

London Plan (2021)

- D6 - Housing quality and standards
- SI2 - Minimising greenhouse gas emissions
- HC1 - Heritage conservation and growth
- T6 - Car parking

Development Management Policies

- DMHB 11 -Design of New Development
- DMHB 12 – Streets and Public Realm
- DMHB 18 – Private Outdoor Amenity Space
- DMHB 14 – Trees and Landscaping
- DMHD 1 – Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
- DMT6 – Vehicle Parking
- LPP D4 - Delivering good design
- LPP D3 – Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach
- LPP D6 – Housing quality and standards

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

6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Reason for Refusal One

Character and Appearance

- 6.1 The Council's first reason for refusal stems around the perceived impact the proposal is considered to have on the host property and the wider area, as a result of its design. The appellant considers that the Council have failed to adequately assess the

character of the dwelling, and the wider character of the street scene within which the property sits.

6.2 In the first instance it is considered to be of value in reviewing the officers commentary within the delegated report. The case officer stated that:

- ***Due to the combination of its width, height and depth, the proposed front extension would create a bulky and prominent addition and would not appear as a subordinate feature to the original dwellinghouse and would represent a visually dominant and unsympathetic form of development. Architecturally, the host is identical in appearance to the immediate neighbouring property, No.15 and this development would lose the existing visual symmetry of the pair. Therefore, the front extension as presented is considered unacceptable as it would have an adverse visual impact on the street scene***

6.3 Policy DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (DMP 2020) sets out that (i) alterations and extensions to the front of a house must be minor and not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street. Front extensions extending across the entire frontage will be refused.

6.4 It is notable that Policy DMHD1 of the Development Plan does not set out a numerical set of guidance for front extensions but focuses on front extensions not consuming the front elevation, thereby dominating the character of the dwelling or street.

6.5 The proposed front extension would be of a modest scale that would be set in from the flank walls of the main body of the dwelling, referred to as original by the Local Planning Authority. The centralisation of the front extension would ensure it does not consume or coalesce with the dwelling in any form but appear subordinate and harmonious with its general appearance. In addition, the build line of dwellings within the street scene are varied and the siting of the front extension would not disrupt this character and orientation of design. Of note No.7 and 17 The Greenway project further forward by virtue of their sizeable front extensions which only reinforces the subtle and harmonious form of development at the appeal site, under the current appeal proposal.

6.6 Furthermore the design of the roof sitting over the extension as well as the fenestration arrangement would be reflective of the other alterations and changes to the dwelling in the form of the extensions. The cumulative impact of the additions including the front extension would ensure they appear secondary in nature and would not detract from the prevailing characteristic of the property or result in a loss of any architectural detailing of importance. The appropriateness of the extension would be supported through the proposed material palette which would further strengthen the compatibility of the existing and proposed built form.

- 6.7 The Council state that the proposal would fail to harmonise with the dwelling, its pairing and wider area. The appellant considers this to not adequately reflect on the character of the area, or similar forms of development which are prevalent within the street scene. The extant 2022 permission allows for the conversion of the garage to a habitable room with a front porch which within itself introduces alterations and additions to the dwelling that are subordinate but unbalance the symmetry identified by the Council.
- 6.8 A detailed assessment of the street scene along both the eastern and western side of the road identifies a varied mix of dwellings, owing to architectural stylings, materials and recent additions/alterations. Properties to the western side within which the appeal site sits are no different. A number of dwellings have modest front extensions with pitched roofs whilst others have more significant alterations with balconies and part single/part two storey elements.
- 6.9 As previously identified it is this variety that characterises The Greenway. The proposed front extension would be a modest and subtle alteration to the dwelling that would not be any more harmful to the street scene than other established forms of development. Further to this the dwelling is to be rendered as identified on the supporting plans and this material palette with the proposed changes would bring the design of the dwelling in line with other forms of neighbouring development. For the Inspectors ease photos relating to these other notable examples within The Greenway are set out within Appendix A of the supporting appendices.
- 6.10 In summary, the proposed front extension would form a harmonious and subordinate addition to the dwelling. Its general design and appearance would not impact the architectural appearance of the dwelling owing to its general proportions and set ins from the flank walls. Further, when viewed in the context of the wider street scene the extension would be a welcome addition to an otherwise varied vernacular.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 In conclusion, it has been demonstrated that the appellant has worked proactively to deliver a scheme that satisfactorily harmonises within the immediate setting and wider street scene.
- 7.2 It has been satisfactorily demonstrated that the Council have considered the impact of the proposal on a technical basis, and not site specifics. The proposal has given significant weight and consideration to other similar forms of development within the area as well as the composition of the existing dwelling. On balance, the proposal would ensure the development successfully harmonises with the character of this developed and varied street scene.

- 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.

