



J & L PLANNING SERVICES

Town & Country Planning Acts

Appeal by Mr Muhammed Salim Miah against the decision by the London Borough of Hillingdon to refuse planning permission for a single storey side and rear extension at 27 Furzeham Road, West Drayton UB7 9DD

Local Planning Authority Reference: 71589/APP/2022/475

Appellants Reference: JL9122

J & L Planning Services
First Floor
1 Hythe Street
Dartford
Kent
DA1 1BE

Tel: 01322 281444
Email: jandlplanningservices@gmail.com

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION
2. THE APPEAL
3. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS
4. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
5. CONCLUSIONS

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This statement has been prepared in support of an appeal against a refusal of planning permission.

2. THE APPEAL

- 2.1 The appeal concerns a refusal of planning permission for a single storey side and rear extension. The Council's reason for refusal is as follows:

The proposed side and rear extension, by virtue of its footprint, bulk, width, design and size would represent a disproportionate addition which fails to respect the architectural integrity of the host property and pair, resulting in visual harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area, all contrary to policies in the development plan including policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) and DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020).

3. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 3.1 The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling located on the north side of Furzeham Road, some 120 metres east of the junction with Brandville Road. The host dwelling occupies a position at the very northern end of the cul-de-sac. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, in terms of both built form and land use.

4 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which came into force in July 2021, outlines the Government's requirements for the planning system and established how these will be addressed. The most relevant paragraphs are stated below:

Paragraph 7 states that: “The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.” Paragraph 8 goes on to explain that “that the planning system has three overarching objectives, which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives):

a) **an economic objective** – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;

b) **a social objective** – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering well-designed, beautiful and safe places, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities’ health, social and cultural well-being; and

c) **an environmental objective** – to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, improving biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.”

- 4.2 These roles should not be undertaken in isolation, because they are mutually dependent. Economic growth can secure higher, social, and environmental standards, and well-designed buildings and places can improve the lives of people and communities. Therefore, to achieve sustainable development, economic, social, and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system. The planning system should play an active role in guiding development to sustainable solutions.
- 4.3 Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural, and historic environment, as well as people's quality of life, including (but not limited to):
1. Making it easier for jobs to be created in cities, towns, and villages.
 2. Moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains for nature.
 3. Replacing poor design with better design.
 4. Improving the conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure; and
 5. Widening the choice of high-quality homes.
- 4.4 The National Planning Policy Framework advocates that the statutory status of the development plan is the starting point for decision making. Proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved and proposed development that conflicts would be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. It is highly desirable that local planning authorities should have an up-to-date plan in place.
- 4.5 At the heart of the planning system is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan making and decision making. Local planning authorities should approve

development proposals that accord with statutory plans without delay, and grant permission where the plan is absent, silent, in determination or where relevant policies are out of date. All these policies should apply unless the adverse impact of allowing development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework, taken as a whole.

- 4.6 The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. Although visual appearance and the architecture of individual buildings are particularly important factors, securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations. Therefore, planning policies and decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural built and historic environment. Furthermore, permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.
- 4.7 Applicants will be expected to work closely with those directly affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community. Proposals that can demonstrate this in developing the design of the new development should be looked on more favourably.
- 4.8 The Borough Council have provided one reason for refusal which, in turn, raises one primary issue, that is, the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. In support of this concern, the Council have referred to provisions within the Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012), and Local Plan: Part Two Development Management Policies (2020). Within this context, the merits of the appeal will be assessed.

BE1

4.9 The requirements of the policy are satisfied for the following reasons:

- (i) The local distinctiveness of the area is comprised of the alignment of the front elevations, the overall height and consistency of the roofscape, the prevailing built form. These distinctive elements of the locality would remain preserved.
- (ii) The local context of the host dwelling is defined by its relatively physically land locked position. Its siting at the utmost end of the cul-de-sac, together with the prevailing pattern of development and the proximity of neighbouring built forms, collectively ensures that the side elevation of the host dwelling occupies a secluded setting. This cloistered context provides a safeguard which protects the public realm. Essentially, the appeal proposal would have an inconsequential presence within the public realm.
- (iii) The linear alignment of the front elevations, together with the recessed siting of the appeal proposal, together with its single storey profile, collectively ensures that the townscape of the locality would remain preserved.
- (iv) The appeal proposal would not result in a loss of existing landscape features.

- (v) The layout, siting of the appeal proposal, set back from the front elevations and set in from the side boundary maintains the street scene.
- (vi) The siting and position of the appeal proposal would not obscure strategic or local views and vistas.
- (vii) The overall scale of the appeal proposal, in terms of its proposed location, would not be visually dominant within the street scene; and
- (viii) The proposed external appearance would employ materials and joinery details which would match the host dwelling.

DMHN 11

4.10 The requirements of this policy are satisfied for the following reasons:

- (i) The scale of the development is contained within an established residential curtilage.
- (ii) The overall height and mass of the proposal, which includes a tile hung roof, would be compatible within its surroundings.
- (iii) The overall height and bulk of adjacent structures would remain visually prominent within the townscape.

- (iv) The layout of the appeal proposal which includes a set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling and a set in from the side boundary, provides visual relief.
- (v) The architectural composition of the appeal proposal would include details such as joinery and reveal details which would be akin within the host dwelling.
- (vi) The design of the appeal proposal, includes a crown roof section which would not be visible at street level. However, the crown roof permits the provision of a pitch roof sections which include a ridge. The proposed roof profile would provide visual cohesion; and
- (vii) The appeal proposal would employ external materials, including joinery details which would match the host dwelling.

DMHD 1

- 4.11 Criteria B and C of the policy are both relevant and material. The thrust of the policy is to preserve residential amenity. The appeal proposal meets the dimensional requirements of the policy. Furthermore, reference to design and external appearance are similar and comparable to policies BE1 and DMHB11. Therefore, reference is made to preceding submissions.

5. CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 The appeal proposal, by virtue of the reasons stated above, would not harm the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

- 5.2 In conclusion, the appellant respectfully requests that the Inspector upholds the appeal.