



APPEAL STATEMENT

Consilio

AGAINST THE LONDON BOROUGH OF HILLINGDON FOR REFUSING PLANNING
PERMISSION FOR THE:

‘Erection of a two storey rear extension with habitable roof space’

(REF: 1055/APP/2023/845)

AT: 49 QUEENS WALK, RUISLIP, HA4 0LX

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.....	5
7.0	CONCLUSION.....	6

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 **'Erection of a two-storey rear extension with habitable roof space, at 49 Queens Walk, Ruislip (Ref 1055/APP/2023/845).'**
- 1.2 The application was refused on a single ground, which states.
- The development proposal, by reason of its size, scale, height, depth, crown roof form and design, would result in a bulky, insubordinate, incongruous, and dominant form of development that would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, to the detriment of the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and surrounding area. For these reasons, the development proposal would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021).
- 1.3 As is the appellant's prerogative, this appeal is submitted under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990).
- 1.4 Within this appeal submission, we will address the proposal and how it satisfies the context of local development plan policies. We identify the following key issues for consideration in this appeal are:
- Whether the proposal would by virtue of the alterations would impact the character of the original dwelling, or wider amenity of the area.

2.0 APPEAL SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The appeal site comprises a detached building located on the western side of Queens Walk adjacent to Down Barns Road. The dwelling itself has recently undergone alterations to the roof from hip-to-gables on both ends as approved under application reference 1055/APP/2022/3345.
- 2.2 Dwellings within the vicinity are varied in appearance with is reflective of their period of construction. Earlier dwellings which were built during the Metropolitan Line expansion around 1900-1910 are characterised by their projecting gable features and clay tiles with stock red brick. Later additions to the street scene are more simplistic in form with mock-Tudor features, use of render and traditional semi-detached pairings with hipped roofs.

- 2.3 The character of the vicinity is established through the linear arrangement of dwellings along the road, following the natural orientation of the highway. Frontages are open for off-street parking with low level front walls or landscaping which contributes to the suburban feel of the road.
- 2.4 It is evident that several dwellings have undergone roof alterations along this side of Queens Walk, notably alteration hip-to-gable extensions including rear dormer windows and front skylights. In the case of semi-detached properties these have resulted in the visual un-balancing of the respective pairings but nonetheless, gable end roofs contribute to the character of the area.
- 2.5 The dwelling itself is not statutorily or locally listed. The site does not fall within the Conservation Area or another designation of note.

3.0 PLANNING HISTORY

- 3.1 The application site has recent planning history, as set out below.
- 1055/APP/2022/3347 – Erection of an outbuilding to rear garden following demolition of existing outbuilding (Lawful Development Certificate) **Approved**
 - 1055/APP/2022/3345 – Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 4 front and 2 rear roof lights and conversion of roof from hip to gable with 2 new gable end windows including removal of existing chimney stacks (Lawful Development Certificate) **Approved and Implemented**
 - 1055/APP/2023/849 – Erection of a two-storey extension to the rear of the dwelling and conversion and new roof space to habitable use to include two Juliette balconies and window to the rear **Refused**

4.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 4.1 This appeal seeks planning permission for the erection of a two-storey rear extension with habitable roof space.
- 4.2 The proposed extension would involve the demolition of an existing two storey out-rigger and span the width of the envelope of the existing building. The extension would match the eaves of the existing dwelling and have a roof profile set down from the main ridge profile.

- 4.3 The extensions would increase the habitable usable space for a three-generation family and look to utilise the space within the roof area of the extension by incorporating it into the existing habitable loft conversion.
- 4.4 For the avoidance of any doubt the proposed gable end roof alterations have been undertaken under the approved Lawful Development Certificate and the front rooflights are in-situ.

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 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, which 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), The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (2020), The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020) and Supplementary Planning Documents.
- 5.5 The following development plan policies are relevant to the assessment of this appeal:

The Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020)

DMHB 11 – Design of New Development

DMHB 14 – Trees and Landscaping

DMHD 1 – Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

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

6.0 PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Character and Appearance

- 6.1 The Council's first reason for refusal stems around the overall size, scale and design of the extension appearing a dominant form of development that would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling.
- 6.2 In the first instance it is of value to review the context of the officers delegated report which states the following:

'The extension would be set across the full width of the existing rear elevation. Consequently, due to the bulk of the proposal, there would be no subordination of the rear element when viewed in relation to the original roof ridge, despite being set

down below the main ridge. In addition, the design would result in the creation of a large flat roof crown feature that would appear an unsympathetic and incongruous roof form. It is noted that there are no similar developments or examples of large crown roofs on nearby properties.'

- 6.3 The planning officer highlights that the proposed depth of the extension is greater than that which is encouraged by the householder residential design guide. The proposed depth of the extension has been designed to reflect the proportions of the existing house and it is considered that the depth of the extension would not detract from the proportions of the existing dwelling. Moreso, where the extensions would be of a similar envelope to that original building and maintaining similar flank profiles which would successfully integrate the original building with the extensions.
- 6.4 The proposed design guidance is based on technical matters and does not reflect individual site circumstances. There would be no distinguishable harm on the appearance of the building between a 4m deep extension or the additional 5m, especially given the siting of the extension parallel to the 5m rear extension at the neighbouring dwelling No.51. Any views of the extension from the public realm or other vantage points would be minimal owing to the relationship between dwellings along the road. Properties tend to have modest spacing between their respective flank walls, often with single paths or alleys which lead to the rear. These modest access widths often result in gaps between dwellings offering limited views of the rear of dwellings, or the deepest parts of their respective gardens often limiting views to the distant skyline. The extent of the extensions would be limited in view from the street scene which is reflective of its appropriate siting and scale within the envelope of the existing building.
- 6.5 Concerns have been raised as to the proposed design of the roof and its amalgamation with the original dwelling. In the first instance it must be highlighted that reference to the original dwelling and roof is now inappropriate and irrelevant following the implementation of the lawful development certificate for the hip-to-gable roof alterations. These alterations have altered the form of the original dwelling but are within themselves a harmonious form of development owing to the presence of gables on either side of the roof slopes. In addition more prominent crown roof exists within the street scene such as No.67 Queens Walk, which appears more prominent where as the appeal proposal is guarded by the gable end roof.
- 6.6 The proposed roof above the extension seeks to span the width of the extension and utilises a three-way hip to be connected to the main profile. The roof is set down from the main ridge to offer a degree of subordination and harmonisation between the existing and new elements. The hipped nature of the roofs along both profiles maintains a symmetrical profile interlocking into the main roof; at no stage does the extension roof appear visually forced or jarring.

- 6.7 The appellant also wishes to express that the only way to maintain a connection to an existing gable end roof profile would be another gable end profile with a valley between the two roofs resulting in a butterfly effect. A butterfly roof typically has a large void space between where the roofs do not connect to one another which can appear poorly designed and also result in long term maintenance issues which would increase pressure to later infill the areas between the two roofs.
- 6.8 When viewed from the rear elevation, the proposed extension would span the width of the dwelling. The extensions would mirror the envelope and profile of the existing dwelling which is within itself square and squat in appearance. The set in of the hipped roof and set down from the main ridge ensures the extension would visually consume or engulf the extension, nor appear to detract from its existing character and profile which is largely one of a flush rear elevation with matching materials.
- 6.9 On balance it is considered that the proposed extension would not detract from the proportions of the existing dwelling. In fact, it would visually harmonise with the existing proportions of the built form and appear secondary to the dwelling it would form part of.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 It is therefore concluded, in respect of these issues raised, that the existing development would preserve and maintain the character and appearance of the site and locality in general, as well as having an appropriate relationship with the neighbouring properties.
- 7.2 Overall, the proposal satisfies the requirements of the NPPF, the London Plan, Development Management Policies and supporting Supplementary Planning Documents.
- 7.3 In light of the above, we respectfully request the Inspector allows the appeal, subject to any planning conditions they considered appropriate to the development.