

APPEAL STATEMENT

**10 THE MALLOWS
ICKENHAM, UB10 9LH**

LOCAL AUTHORITY REF NO. 62851/APP/2022/3823

Prepared By
The Gillett Macleod Partnership

14th April 2023

CONTEXT

The host property for this proposed house extension was built as part of a housing estate in the mid 1960's and the majority of the houses are of a similar design and reflect the rather plain architecture of this period. Many of the houses have forward projecting integral garages with flat roofs which project forward considerably from the main building line giving the area a distinct character.

There are nine houses in The Mallows which are built as a close. There are four houses on the East of the close including the appeal site at No 10. Out of these five houses, three have been extended to the front of the property across the whole frontage incorporating the original flat roof forward projecting integral garage.

No 4 The Mallows was refused planning consent by the local authority for similar reasons to the appellant's refusal. This was the subject of appeal and the inspector did not uphold the local authority's refusal and planning permission was granted. The appeal reference is (APP/R5510/D/12/2168966) see appendix 1. The inspector noted the following:

“By matching the alignment and general form of the projections on the two adjacent properties, the extension would also not be eye catching but would create a greater degree of harmony to the street scene around the junction of Boniface Road and the Mallows.”

No 7 The Mallows is a detached property immediately opposite the appeal site and has been substantially extended in recent years. It occupies a very similar position in the close to No 10 being tucked away in the corner at the end of the close, set away from the public highway and I feel that this is the reason that the council, at the time, considered the full width, single storey front extension which extended across the full width of the existing house and across the two storey side extension, in a similar way to the appellant's proposal, was considered acceptable.

STATEMENT OF CASE

The planning application which was refused by the London Borough of Hillingdon on 7th March 2023 has cited one reason for refusal which stated “The proposed single storey front extension, by reason of its sitting, design, width, bulk and massing, would result in an overly dominant and incongruous form of development that would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, thereby harming the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the visual amenities of the area.”

This reason for refusal referred only to the single storey front extension from which we can infer that the other aspects of the proposal were acceptable. It therefore comes down to whether it is reasonable to have a single storey forward projecting extension which lines through with the integral garage in terms of the character and appearance of the original dwelling house and the area in general.

Given the context of the appeal site where extensions on the majority of the houses have extended in a similar way, I do not feel that the argument that the character would be unduly affected is sustainable. Whether the composition of the original dwelling house is affected detrimentally is a matter of personal opinion. However I am of the opinion that it would not unduly affect the character and architectural composition which although pleasant is not the most dynamic architectural composition being reflective of its 1960's design and does rather lend itself to being extended in the form proposed in the refused application.

CONCLUSION

Whilst I accept that there are no precedents in planning and that each case must be taken on its merits, I feel that the character and appearance of our client's proposal would not look out of place in its surroundings. The buildings in the close, known as The Mallows, are an attractive group of buildings, albeit of a plain architectural style and have not been harmed in character by the numerous extensions carried out. Our clients proposal is quite similar to other extensions in The Mallows and I feel the council have been inconsistent in refusing our client's application.

Jeffrey Gillett, R.I.B.A.

APPENDIX 1



The Planning
Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 March 2012

by Martin Brookes BA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19 March 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/12/2168966

4 The Mallows, Ickenham, Uxbridge, Middlesex, UB10 8BX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Catherine Silwal against the decision of The Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 6602/APP/2011/2162, dated 5 September 2011, was refused by notice dated 2 November 2011.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension and change of use of integral garage to habitable room.
-

Application for Costs

1. An application for costs was made by Mrs Catherine Silwal against The Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon. This application will be the subject of a separate decision.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension and change of use of integral garage to habitable room at 4 The Mallows, Ickenham, Uxbridge, Middlesex in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 6602/APP/2011/2162, dated 5 September 2011, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 11/127/1 and 11/127/2.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external walls of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is one of many in Boniface Road and The Mallows of broadly similar design, an unusual and distinctive feature of which is a flat roofed garage projecting forward of the main front wall of the house. It also lies within a row of five houses on the eastern side of The Mallows that are of the same original design with a flat roofed enclosed porch beside the projecting garage.
5. The proposed extension would result in a flat roofed projection across the whole of the front of the property to align with the front of the existing garage.
6. The Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement Supplementary Planning Document: *Residential Extensions* (2008) (HDAS) is clear that front extensions that extend across the entire frontage will normally be refused. It states: *Front extensions are eye catching and change the face of the building. They do not only affect the character and appearance of the building itself, but also the street scene.*
7. However, the guidance in the HDAS needs to be applied to the particular site circumstances. Flat roofed projections across the whole of a front elevation are not a common feature in Boniface Road and The Mallows, but there are several close to the appeal site. These include 15 Boniface Road, where an extension similar to the appeal proposal was allowed on appeal (ref: APP/R5510/D/10/2124349) in 2010, and Nos 2 and 6 The Mallows.
8. The appeal property already has flat roofed projections across more than half its front elevation. A projection across the remainder would not therefore materially change the face of the building or its character and appearance. By matching the alignment and general form of the projections on the two adjacent properties, the extension would also not be eye catching but would create a greater degree of harmony to the street scene around the junction of Boniface Road and The Mallows.
9. My conclusion is that the extension would not have a harmful effect on the character or appearance of the area. It would be in harmony with the existing building and street scene and would complement the amenity and character of the area. Consequently it would not conflict with saved (September 2007) Policies BE13, BE15 or BE19 of the adopted (1998) London Borough of Hillingdon Unitary Development Plan (UDP).

Conditions

10. I agree with the Council that a condition requiring the use of matching materials for the walls is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. In addition, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in compliance with the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised I allow the appeal.

Martin Brookes INSPECTOR