



APPEAL STATEMENT

Consilio

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

‘Retention of a part single storey, part double story rear extension, first floor side extension and a garage conversion. Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 3 front roof lights, a rear dormer and conversion of roof from hip to gable end. Alterations to fenestration (Retrospective Application)’
(REF: 6206/APP/2023/345)

AT: 1 GROVE CLOSE, ICKENHAM, UB10 8QN

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 **'retention of a part single storey, part double storey rear extension, first floor side extension and garage conversion. Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 3 front roof lights, a rear dormer and conversion of roof from hip to gable end. Alterations to fenestration (retrospective application)'**, at 1 Grove Close, Ickenham (Ref 6206/APP/2023/345).

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

- *The proposed extensions, by reason of their siting, bulk, design and appearance would fail to successfully integrate and harmonise with the architectural composition of the existing dwelling and would unbalance the semi-detached pair. The development would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the building, semi detached pairing, street scene and surrounding area and would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2012), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - 2 Development Management Policies (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 extension would cause incongruous and unsympathetic design detrimental to the character and appearance of the property and wider area;
- Whether sufficient weight has been afforded to the 'permitted development' fallback position

2.0 APPEAL SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

2.1 The appeal site is located on the southern side of Grove Close, set within a cul-de-sac to the west of The Grove.

2.2 The dwelling has undergone recent extension and alterations which are the subject of this appeal as well as an extant earlier permission. The dwelling has been finished in a

white render similar to other neighbouring properties which is reflective of the mixed material palette in the road which includes red brick, tile hung and white render.

- 2.3 Dwellings within the close have benefitted from extensions in the form of two-storey side and first floor side extensions with a very limited number of properties original in their appearance or form. As such the prevailing character of the road is one of the uniformity of the siting of buildings and their relationship with the road, as well as their open frontages creating a suburban pattern and rhythm to the road.
- 2.4 Having consideration for the wider character and context, dwellings within neighbouring roads such as Halford Road and Swakeleys Drive are varied in their designs at roof level owing to roof alterations/extensions taking place to provide habitable accommodation. The extent of the alterations includes dormer windows, hip-to-gable alterations as well as roof lights.
- 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. In 2022 planning permission was granted for a similar form of development, which is attached to the associated appendices for the Inspectors ease (Appendix A)
- 6206/APP/2022/608 - Erection of a first-floor side extension, single storey rear and part double storey rear extension, conversion of garage space to habitable room and internal alterations. (Approved)

4.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 4.1 This appeal submission seeks planning permission for the retention of a part single storey, part double story rear extension, first floor side extension and a garage conversion. Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 3 front roof lights, a rear dormer and conversion of roof from hip to gable end. Alterations to fenestration (Retrospective Application).
- 4.2 In 2022 planning permission was granted for the erection of a first-floor side extension, single storey rear and part double storey rear extension, conversion of garage space to habitable room and internal alterations (Appendix A).
- 4.3 Following the grant of planning permission and prior to works being undertaken, the appellants utilised Schedule 2, Part 1, Class B relating to the additions and alterations

of roofs involving dormer windows. The proposed works were undertaken in isolation and altered the original roof profile from a hip-to-gable including dormer window along the rear roof profile.

- 4.4 Subsequently the appellant undertook works relating to the side and rear extension. The appellant acknowledges that they followed the advice of their planning agent in error which was based on the suggestion and guise that works could be undertaken with relation to the footprint of the approved extensions under application ref 6206/APP/2022/608. Considering this advice, the appellant and their contractor considered it more appropriate for the roof of the extension to mirror that of the recently constructed hip-to-gable profile.
- 4.5 Following the substantial completion of works on site, the Local Planning Authorities Enforcement officer wrote to the appellants informing them of an intended site visit following receipt of a complaint. The appellant was advised to retrospectively apply for the works carried out, with the enforcement officer accepting the only deviation from plans related to that of the side extension roof and dormer window. All other matters relating to the ground floor extensions and other alterations were considered to be in accordance with the approved plans.

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
- 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 Council's decision notice specifically references the proposed roof alterations and extensions, would fail to successfully integrate and harmonise with the architectural composition of the existing dwelling appearing detrimental to the character and appearance of the building, street scene and surrounding area.
- 6.2 In the first instance it is of value to consider the case officers commentary within their delegated report to understand the focus of the LPAs concerns, in refusing planning permission. Within page 6 of the associated delegated report the planning officer states:
- *'The loft conversion involving a hip to gable extension and large rear dormer would also represent an incongruous addition. In particular, roof alterations such as a hip to gable will not normally be supported particularly where they would unbalance the appearance of a pair of semi-detached properties. In this case the subject property forms part of a pair of semi-detached properties whereby the adjoining property has retained its hipped roof form. As such, the introduction of a hip to gable roof extension in this case would be unacceptable, harming their shared group value. This extension would significantly alter the appearance of the property when viewed from the street scene adding significant bulk and massing at roof level. This combination is worsened by the existing and proposed extensions at the property and the resultant plethora of roof forms created.'*
- 6.3 The assessment suggests that the LPA considers the roof alterations and dormer window to represent unsympathetic additions to the dwelling, as well as the pairing within which the dwelling sits. The appellant considers that the Council have failed to consider the site specifics which includes works being undertaken relating to the roof utilising the permitted development rights of the dwelling. As previously set out, the dwelling was altered from a hip-to-gable and a dormer window constructed utilising

the provisions of the GPDO. The works undertaken altered the appearance of the roof and in doing so resulted in a roof form that differed to the neighbouring properties profile.

- 6.4 Notwithstanding the fallback position set out above, the extensions have been sensitively designed to respect the proportions of the existing house. The gable roof profile sitting above the first-floor side extension is set down from the main ridge of the dwelling, maintaining a design that is harmonious and in synergy with the main roof profile. In doing so, the extensions and resulting roof profiles appear to satisfactorily integrate and harmonise with the overall appearance of the dwelling. The set-back and set-down of the first-floor extension roof ensures that the roof profile when viewed as a whole does not consume or appear as an elongated form of development.
- 6.5 In lowering the roof profile and setting this back from the front elevation, the extension which is already visually well-guarded by the mature vegetation and landscaping features running parallel to the flank boundary, would achieve the overarching aims of the development plan policies. The context of the policies do not exclude the erection of gable walls or first floor extensions where appropriately designed.
- 6.6 It is noted that other dwellings within the close also benefit from side extensions of a similar nature and are now a prevailing pattern and form of development, which contribute to the character of the road. In some instances, these other established forms of development do not benefit from set-downs or set-backs with respect to their roof profiles and have unbalanced the pairings within which they are viewed. Notably examples at No. 2 and 4 Grove Close, demonstrate that any modest degree of unbalancing of pairings is not within itself detrimental to the established pattern of development.
- 6.7 Turning our attention to the dormer window, the Council raised concerns within their decision notice and delegated report as to the size and scale of the window. Policy DMHD 1 is explicit in its aims that dormer windows should not engulf the roof plane within which they are viewed. The policy expressly sets out that dormers should be centrally positioned, set down below the ridge of the roof and set above the eaves and be no more than two thirds the width of the original roof face.
- 6.8 The dormer window has been set down from the ridge by 500mm, set up from the eaves by 650mm and would not engulf the resulting roof profile to a degree that it would appear the dominant feature. Whilst it is accepted that the dormer window would marginally extend beyond two thirds of the roof plane, the mechanism in constructing this related to the use of permitted development from which the council would have no recourse or action to restrict the applicant from utilising.

- 6.9 The dormer window in its current guise when viewed within the wider development does not dominate the roof and there remains sufficient spacing, gaps and roof plane free from development as not to result in a disproportionate development or one that conflicts with the overarching aims of Policy DMHD1. Furthermore, the dormer window would be well guarded from view as a result of the first-floor side extension and the strength of the density of landscaping along the flank boundary. Given the dormer windows are well contained within the rear roof slope and well screened, would not be harmful to the character of the property or wider vicinity.
- 6.10 Summing up, although the host's appearance has changed as a result of the scheme, it would not result in a markedly awkward designed building which would not relate to others in the area or would not detract from the general pattern of development within the close. It is too ambiguous of the LPA to suggest gable roofs in isolation are harmful to the appearance of the street scene as the absence of a form of development is not within itself inappropriate or unacceptable where suitably designed.

Other Material Considerations

- 6.11 Within the Council's decision notice reference was made the unbalancing of the pairing of semi-detached properties within which the dwelling is viewed. The appellant considers that the Council have failed to afford any weighting to the fallback position previously laid out, notably the use of permitted development rights altering the roof profile.
- 6.12 The Local Planning Authority have limited control over the utilisation of these rights as they remain available to the property in isolation. The appellant could and has utilised the GPDO (2015 as amended) to alter the hip-to-gable and inserting the dormer window which in turn naturally unbalanced the appearance of the dwellings. Any impact on the street scene as a result of these works could not be considered under the Order. The resultant works would have meant that the amalgamation of a hip roof above the extension into the main body gable would have appeared visibly forced and failed to coalesce. The use of a gable to gable profile as under the current plans and design remains the most appropriate scheme. As such, greater weighting should have been afforded to this fallback position in the assessment of the current application.

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. 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 consider appropriate to the development.

