



APPEAL STATEMENT

Consilio

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

‘Erection of a part single storey and part two storey extension to the side and rear of the dwelling. Erection of a front extension with amendments to fenestration and installation of new integral garage. Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 2 front roof lights, 2 side roof lights, 2 rear dormers and replacement of existing roof with new hipped roof.’

(REF: 35699/APP/2023/1115)

AT: 14 Warren Road, Ickenham, UB10 8AB

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.....	7

APPENDIX A – APPEAL DECISION -ALLOWED 35699/APP/2022/513

APPENDIX B – APPEAL DECISION- ALLOWED 35699/APP/2016/3345

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 part single storey and part two storey extension to the side and rear of the dwelling. Erection of a front extension with amendments to fenestration and installation of new integral garage. Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 2 front rooflights, 2 side roof lights, 2 rear dormers and replacement of existing roof with new hipped roof'**, at 14 Warren Road (Ref 35699/APP/2023/1115).

1.2 The application was refused on a single ground, which states.

The proposal by reason of its excessive size, scale and bulk and incongruous and unsympathetic roof design would represent an unduly intrusive and incongruous form of development which would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the surrounding area. Therefore, the proposed development would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012), Policies 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 harm 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 dwelling located on the southern side of Warren Road, set behind a boundary wall and gates with off-street parking provision. The dwelling is set on a sloping part of Warren Road which is reflected in the higher levels of the dwelling to the west with a gradual incline of ground levels as you travel up along towards Swakeleys Road.

2.2 The dwelling itself is characterised by its gable-end roof feature and yellow sandstone type appearance finished in a sand and cement finish. The dwelling has been extended

from its original form which is reflective in its bits and pieces style appearance with additions often failing to respond to the wider building. The dwelling when viewed within the context of its neighbours and wider street scene offers limited architectural value to the street scene and does not respond to the prevailing character of development within the street scene.

- 2.3 Dwellings within the street scene along Warren Road have evolved from their original form either through significant extension/alteration or total replacement of dwellings. Dwellings are often extended at two-storey level with a significant number of roof alterations having been undertaken which adds to the established character of the street scene. Notable examples exist of crown roofs and dormer windows within both sides of the street scene nestled between more modest dwellings and often small rows of extended dwellings with crown roofs.
- 2.4 For the ease of the Inspector a number of recently approved schemes as well as appeal decisions within the street scene have been attached to this appeal statement as appendices. In addition, the recent appeal decision at the appeal site forms part of Appendix A. The history of the appeal site is set out in the next section of this appeal.
- 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.
- 35699/APP/2022/513 – Erection of a two storey rear extension, single storey side and front extension, a first floor front extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use **(Allowed at appeal) Appendix A**
 - 35699/APP/2016/3345 – First floor front extension **(Allowed at appeal) Appendix B**

4.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 4.1 This application seeks to extend the dwelling at two-storey to the rear and first floor level to the front incorporating a hipped roof with dormer windows.
- 4.2 Following the outcome of the appeal related to the 2022 application at the site the appellants considered that the appearance of the dwelling did not sit comfortably within the context of the street scene. In light of this they sought to enhance the

character of the building through extensions that created more linear arrangements similar to other dwellings within the street scene.

- 4.3 The proposed footprint of the extensions does not exceed that of the previously allowed appeal scheme. The changes largely involve 'squaring-off' areas at first floor to allow for a traditional hipped roof profile.

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 extensions 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:

'In addition, it is acknowledged that an appeal was allowed for the erection of a two storey rear extension, single storey side and front extension, a first floor front extension and conversion of roof space to habitable use in 2023. The appeal Inspector in appeal reference APP/R5510/D/22/3304320 advised:

"The extension would therefore form an appropriately designed addition which would not be of excessive scale nor bulk. Consequently, there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling nor area"

Given the inspectors previous conclusions, it is accepted that the principle of a first floor front extension, garage to the front and a part first floor rear extension are considered acceptable. However, the current planning application is vastly different to the previously allowed schemes. There has been a significant change to the roof design, two storey front extension, and a full width rear extension.

The Inspector previously made some key points which are relevant to the assessment of the rear extension: "its ridgeline would be minimally set below that on the main dwelling and it would not excessively obscure the rear elevation of dwelling. This would also serve to limit the bulk of the extension"

Contrary to this point and Policy DMHD1, the current scheme extends the full width of the rear, at ground floor, first floor and features a double gable feature to rear of the new roof. As a result, the proposal does significantly increase the overall bulk of the roof to the rear, obscuring the entirety of the rear elevation and would present as a three storey extension which doesn't respect the architectural integrity of the host property or established pattern of development on and around Warren Road. Set over three floors, the rear and roof addition would be harmful. It is accepted that this is positioned to the rear however, this would still be visible and notable in its siting and position.

Concerns also remain in terms of the scale and bulk of the rear extensions in combination with the front extensions. Cumulatively, the proposed extensions would result in harm to the architectural integrity of the host dwelling which would result in incongruous additions. The proposal by reason of its excessive size, scale and bulk would represent an unduly intrusive and incongruous form of development which would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the surrounding area. Therefore, the proposed development would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan (November 2012), Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Part Two (2020) and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).'

- 6.3 Having reviewed the context of the delegated report it appears that the Councils reasoning for refusal focuses wholly on the rear extension and roof alterations with reference made to the impact the proposal would have on the architectural composition of the dwelling.
- 6.4 In the first instance the appellant contests the value afforded to the existing dwelling. Whilst extensions are often sought to harmonise with the existing dwelling, they are also an opportunity to uplift and enhance the appearance of a dwelling. The existing

dwelling has limited architectural value and is often lost within the context of the street scene and this heavily developed part of Warren Road. To the west and north-western parts of the road there are significant examples of dwellings having been significantly re-altered from their original form to create architecturally pleasing homes that fit well within the context of the road. The Council strongly reference the architectural appearance of the dwelling without identifying the importance of the features and the dwelling, and how they contribute to the character of the street scene. The appellant considers the absence of justification to be a strong sign that the dwelling does not afford any positive contribution to the setting of the road.

- 6.5 The proposed rear extensions at first floor level would not extend beyond the flank walls of the existing dwelling. They have been designed to reflect the proportions of the house and their overall depth and width would not result in a disproportionate or incongruous form of design.
- 6.6 The Council reference the extensions as being 3-storey in nature which the appellant considers mis-leading and semantics designed to exacerbate the harm of the design. Large, hipped roofs with modest flat crowns represent an established form of development within the context of the street scene. Their appearance and presence is widespread across the road. The appeal scheme roof has been designed to respect the proportions of the dwelling and its context between two neighbouring properties with a shallow angle ensuring the ridge height of the dwelling would not stand proud of either No.12 or No.16. The overall appearance of the dwelling is demonstrated in the supporting street scene drawing which represents how the dwelling would be viewed.
- 6.7 Reference is made to the glazing introduced into the rear aspect of the roof. The use of glazing offers users of the habitable space within the roof better outlook and is a positive design aspect which would not be readily visible from any public vantage point. The absence of glazing would be replaced by a more traditional tile hung gable finish which would equally respond to the character of the resultant building but not offer a positive design opportunity such as the glazing.
- 6.8 The supporting appendices provide a number of recently approved schemes along the road which introduce significantly larger crown roofs with greater ridge heights and angles. The overall massing of these examples which are both adjacent the appeal site only serve to represent the inconsistent approach taken to considering the established character of the road surrounding roof designs.
- 6.9 The proposed front extensions have been designed in a manner to 'square-off' the frontage to appear more symmetrical than the current dwelling. The current appearance of the dwelling is one of mis-matched appearance with no prevailing form or type which as previously touched upon, offers limited value to the character of the street scene offering no positive value. The symmetrical and square appearance of

dwelling in symmetrical and regular plots is a prevailing character within the road, notably at Nos. 8 and 17 Warren Road as well as other examples to the south of the site.

- 6.10 On balance it is considered that the extension and alteration of the dwelling has been previously agreed as acceptable by Inspectors under recent appeal decisions. The design of the extensions has been sensitively pieced together to respond to the established character of Warren Road which is constantly evolving. The symmetrical and square nature of the dwelling would only serve to enhance the appearance of this dwelling which offers no valuable architectural merit to the street scene and its re-modelling would only enhance this side of Warren Road.

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.