

MICHAEL OAKES, B.A.Hons
Dipl. Architecture

REGISTERED ARCHITECT
DESIGNER *and* ILLUSTRATOR
email; michaeloakesarchitect@gmail.com
phone or fax 01895 235089

To the Planning Inspectorate,
Room 3/07, Kite Wing,
Temple Quay House, 2 The Square,
Temple Quay, Bristol, BS1 6PN

Grounds of Appeal.

Re; a retrospective planning application regarding aspects of a domestic extension at 38 Frays Avenue, West Drayton, Middlesex, UB7 7AG (Hillingdon Council reference 58891/APP/2017/4188), for Mr Reza).

Dear Sir/ Madam,

Mr Reza and his family have already improved various aspects of their home and are planning ahead for their family's future here. The extra accommodation 'volume' already planning-approved and built here will provide suitable living space for their growing family.

However, Mr Reza and his builders have built an addition to the planning-approved project, at variance to the approved drawings, without obtaining further necessary planning permission.

He has taken the first opportunity to apply for a retrospective planning decision here, as soon as the issue was raised and he was made aware that a further planning permission was needed. This retrospective application was accompanied by detailed drawings and as-built photographs, together with historic photographs of this property and other nearby extended properties, and a diagram showing the varied/ stepped street building-line here.

Mr Reza deeply regrets that he did not consult with the local authority duty planning officer or a qualified planning professional, before progressing with the construction of the front door canopy here.

We still feel that the works/ finishes, as-built here, do not detract from the appearance of this extended property, or stand out unduly in a street-scene here, and we feel that the council's reason for their decision is based, to a degree, on subjective opinion, and, perhaps, a worry that if the canopy were to be retrospectively approved, then there may be a strong chance that the canopy is further glazed and eventually fully enclosed here. We welcome the further considered view of the Planning Inspector re these matters.

We also reiterate that the council's stated reasons for refusal eg (to quote, re the as-built front canopy), '...by reason of its size, scale, bulk, projection forward of the dwelling and design fails to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling, and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and the wider Garden City, West Drayton Area of Special Local Character' is subjective, and we welcome the inspector's considered opinion on the particular issues below.

M. Oakes, Architect. 10 Parkfield Avenue, Hillingdon, Middlesex, UB10 0DF, Great Britain

If the inspector, on balance, is unable to approve this application, we hope that the inspector may be able to highlight aspects of this design that the inspector perceives to be approve-able (eg, the concept of a canopy here, of a size and architectural style yet to be determined), to perhaps assist both the council and client to decide if any canopy design has the chance of eventually receiving planning approval here.

We welcome the inspectors considered thoughts re the following aspects of this appeal..

1. the design and position of the as-built front canopy to the front door..

a. The materials and fenestration of the canopy here match the existing property (eg, a continuation of the flat roof detail, as proposed and approved to the rear elevation; and white rendered masonry finishes).

b. Please refer to the recent photographs ‘in context’ to show how the canopy extension looks here (whilst the canopy here is undeniably ‘not tiny’, we would suggest that the open-nature of the canopy here and the lack of a red/ brown clay tiled roof here diminishes its bulk); we look forward to hearing the Planning Inspector’s views re whether this feature is ‘incongruous and overly dominant’ here.

c. Now the clients are aware that this detail needs (retrospective) planning permission, they have been given the confidence to at least try for retrospective planning consent here because of the variety of designs of original houses, extensions and ‘new build house detailing’ along this road frontage.

d. Whilst we are aware that each planning application is different, and assessed on its own merits, the client strongly feels that the canopy as-built is (subjectively) attractive.

e. Ironically, the client has already considerably improved the attractiveness of the front of the property here when viewed from the public realm since he purchased the property, by removing the imposing 2-metre high white rendered brick/ block garden wall immediately adjacent to the public footpath here, and replacing it with a more ‘transparent and delicate’ brick wall surmounted by a black wrought-iron railings (please refer to planning application drawing 04A, photo taken in 2017 on the right, and ‘as-was’ photos to the left).

f. There are already a number of (subjectively) more traditional red clay roof-tiled large front porches nearby (eg, at number 44 Frays Avenue), BUT there is also a large and very visible flat-roofed double garage at number 40 ‘the Willows’ Frays Avenue. **Also, the adjoining semi-detached numbers 28 and 28A Frays Avenue also have a full-width integral ground-floor front, flat-roofed detail, original and corresponding to the architectural fashions of the time. However, these additions/details are only noticeable (in our opinion) when consciously studying the architecture along this avenue, which appears to suggest that the size and width of plots here, allow for a wide range of architectural styles and compositions to co-exist.**

g. We feel that the considerable distance between the front boundary of the property and the road here, may also allow more scope for a variety of additional volumes and architectural styles along this Avenue to continue to co-exist.

h. We note that the mature hedge between numbers 36 and 38 Frays Avenue is currently the same height/ higher than the as-built canopy (please refer to the photo, bottom row, second from left of the original planning drawing 03A). Such a relationship means that the canopy's height here is not visible as you proceed up this avenue; and the height of other neighbour's front-facing brick walls and other greenery, mean that it is difficult to clearly view the canopy as you drive or walk back down the avenue too; this canopy can only be clearly viewed when directly in front of this property.

We welcome the inspector's considered opinion regarding the above points.

If the inspector were to agree to approve the as-built canopy here, the clients are aware that there would be absolutely no automatic right/ no permitted development rights to enclose this canopy, either now or in the future. A clearly-worded condition to this effect on any supportive decision would be welcomed.

CONCLUSION

We still feel that this extension, as -built and if retrospectively approved, will not detract from the quality of the architecture/ street scene here

We hope that the inspector can take all the above points and comments into consideration when reviewing this appeal and we look forward to receiving the inspector's considered response.

cc client