

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; the 'recently refused' planning application regarding aspects of a domestic extension at
44 Stanley Road, Northwood, HA6 1RG (Hillingdon Council reference
46234/APP/2018/1585), for Mr Elfsberg.

Dear Sir/ Madam,

Mr Elfsberg and his family are looking forward to improving various aspects of their home and are planning ahead for their future here. The proposed extension works here will considerably improve the way that this dwelling can work for them.

Because the proposal is in an area deemed 'an Area of Special Local Character', we were careful to design these proposals to match with existing materials and fenestration, and as a relatively subservient new volume with reference to that of the main house.

However, these proposals (or at least, one aspect of these proposals) have currently been refused by Hillingdon Council.

We still feel that the scheme, as proposed here, would not detract from the appearance of this property, or stand out unduly in the street-scene here, and we feel that the council's reason for their decision is based, to a degree, on subjective opinion. We welcome the further considered view of the Planning Inspector re these matters.

We contend that these proposals (at the very least), succeed in preserving the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene here by 'harmonising with the materials, design features, architectural style and building heights predominant in the area' (which would mean that these proposals would, in these circumstances, conform with the council's stated planning policies).

We are pleased to note that the council has no concerns regarding the raising of the main roof ridge and side eaves here, and no stated concerns regarding the proposed 1.5 metre deep rear extension – **the council's sole stated concern here is the perceived appearance of the proposed front-facing single hipped roof, with 2 x front-facing veluxes.**

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 keeping the proposed single hipped front loft volume here, and replacing the proposed velux windows with a copied small front-facing dormer and/ or a side gable over one or other of the existing two front bay windows of a size and 'conservative appearance' yet to be determined), to perhaps assist both the council and client to decide if

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

any such further tweaked 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 hipped front roof extension..

a. The materials and fenestration of the proposed hipped front roof extension here match the existing property and the details of the adjacent properties.

b. There are a number of front-facing and side-facing velux windows present along the length of this street (eg, one in the detached property opposite this address), approved by the council under planning applications (others have been installed under permitted development rights), so we feel that the proposal to insert a velux window is not alien to this street-scene.

c. There are many small front-facing dormer windows present along this street; indeed, if we were not already proposing a 'size' of new loft volume here, we would have proposed a further small front dormer window to match those existing on our two neighbouring properties, and to match those on the three properties opposite. But we still feel that the velux arrangement chosen is in keeping with the quality and character of the street, and the subservient nature of the designed frontage. However, we welcome the inspector's observations re this chosen detail.

d. Please refer to the recent scale 3d computer generated views 'in context' to show how the proposed front hipped roof extension would look here (drawing 52A) in relation to the two adjacent properties, numbers 42 and 46 Stanley Road. We look forward to hearing the Planning Inspector's views re whether this proposal appears unattractive and out-of scale.

(The council contend 'by reason of the size, scale and bulk of the front hip roof would fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the street scene' here).

e. We contend that our 'symmetrical front elevation design here' fits nicely with the mirror-image designs of the immediate neighbouring properties at number 42 and 46 (their bay window front-rooms and roof gable details extend slightly further forward than any of our frontage here, on the corner of their properties, furthest away from our property).

f. Whilst we agree with the council officer's observation that many of the properties along this road have a subordinate hipped or gable roof detail to the front, we would contend that the 3d views of our proposal as illustrated on drawing 52A show a proposed subordinate front hipped roof, lower in height than the main (raised) roof ridge height behind this (this ridge running parallel to the street), all these proposals perceived to sit slightly further back away from the building-line along the street here due to no front gables or front dormers being proposed here.

g. Whilst we are aware that each planning application is different, and assessed on its own merits, the client strongly feels that the proposed front single hipped roof extension does not (subjectively) 'have a negative impact' on the area.

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

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

If the inspector were still minded to dismiss this appeal solely due to concerns re the lack of a small gable detail here, we would welcome any views that the inspector may wish to make re the approve-ability of any future proposal, that might then propose such a small gable detail.

CONCLUSION

We still feel that this extension, if 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.

Final 'Project design' Footnote..

The design of the proposed loft conversion and other extensions have been considered by the clients for a length of time. The proposed new first-floor 'bedroom 3' here would complement the position of the master bedroom to the rear here, with access to the proposed shared shower room/ wc to the side, from the landing.

Due to the necessity for habitable rooms to have outlooks to the front and back, the proposal of the extended front hipped roof loft space was critical to gain enough useable head-height for the proposed bedroom here (eg, the standing-space in these plans is much smaller than indicated, a dashed blue line shows the 1.8m head-height line).

Background information- Since receiving this planning refusal (subject to this appeal), a new amended planning application has been prepared and submitted and is currently with Hillingdon Council (application reference number 46234/APP/2018/2776, due for a decision by 24th September 2018). Sadly, this proposal currently does not allow enough space for a further first-floor front bedroom (this smaller space is indicated to be used as a study), so we would still welcome a 'positive outcome' re this appeal, regardless of any permission or refusal that might be received in September.

cc client