

From: Cliff Patch <cliff.patch@blueyonder.co.uk>
Subject: Re: Planning - 5 Windermere Avenue
Date: 27 April 2018 at 09:39:59 BST
To: Charlotte Spencer <cspencer2@hillingdon.gov.uk>

Hi Charlotte,

My architect is on holiday until the 6th May so I can't get anything done with the plans at this point but I'll run through with him upon his return. If you can leave it with me until then I'll get back to you.

Thanks

Cliff

On 27 Apr 2018, at 08:17, Charlotte Spencer <cspencer2@hillingdon.gov.uk> wrote:

Hi Cliff,

That is fine. Were you wanting to amend the plans to add the set down from the ridge or set down from the front and to add the fence or would you like me to continue with the plans as originally submitted.

Kind Regards
Charlotte

On 26 April 2018 at 15:40, Cliff Patch <cliff.patch@blueyonder.co.uk> wrote:
Hi Charlotte,

We'll await the formal decision and take the matter forward once received.

Thanks again for your time over the last few weeks whilst we've been corresponding.

Regards

Cliff

On 23 Apr 2018, at 08:52, Charlotte Spencer <cspencer2@hillingdon.gov.uk> wrote:

Hi Cliff,

I believe that you would not be able to breach the return building line. I am happy to accept amended plans where this does not occur. I would also like to remind you of your right to appeal following any refusal.

Please note the above is officer opinion only and does not necessarily represent to final views of the Council.

Kind Regards
Charlotte

On 20 April 2018 at 11:54, Cliff Patch <cliff.patch@blueyonder.co.uk> wrote:
Charlotte.

Thanks for confirming my queries. In your response, are you confirming that there is no further negotiation to be had on the building line issue?

Thanks

Cliff

On 19 Apr 2018, at 08:45, Charlotte Spencer <cspencer2@hillingdon.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Cliff,

Those issues were dealt with, however, the sticking point is still the forward projection of the return building line.

Kind Regards
Charlotte

On 17 April 2018 at 15:43, Cliff Patch <cliff.patch@blueyonder.co.uk> wrote:
Hi Charlotte,

Thanks for your response.

Your original contact email contained a number of points most of which I believe we addressed in our subsequent conversation. So to help me understand where we have got to, can you please review the below points.

- We discussed and you were satisfied that, when scaled from the larger scale drawings submitted with the planning application, there remains significantly more than 60sqm of amenity space within the proposed development. On top of this there is a side garden that can be fenced to provide additional amenity space and we also agreed that there is a substantial park within 5mins of our house. All of these points helped to overcome your concern.
- Having raised your concern about the new roof line with my architect, it is intended that it will be set down by 0.5m.
- You and I discussed that the standard set back of 1m may be negotiable within the context of an overall scheme.

Thanks

Cliff

On 17 Apr 2018, at 14:26, Charlotte Spencer <cspencer2@hillingdon.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Cliff,

Currently there would have to be a large amendment from the current as per my original contact.

Kind Regards
Charlotte

On 16 April 2018 at 10:10, Cliff Patch <cliff.patch@blueyonder.co.uk> wrote:
Hi Charlotte,

Thanks for your response. I had hoped we could have another telephone conversation about the proposed extension to see if there is any mileage in adapting the current design to make it more workable for both of us.

Do you think this would be worthwhile?

Regards

Cliff

On 16 Apr 2018, at 08:24, Charlotte Spencer <cspencer2@hillingdon.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Cliff,

Even if they are extensions they are old enough for them not to have a site history on the system, and Policy would have changed. Also they are not within the immediate area to your property so cannot be used as a precedent in this case.

Kind Regards
Charlotte

On 11 April 2018 at 12:37, Cliff Patch <cliff.patch@blueyonder.co.uk> wrote:
Hi Charlotte,

Apologies, I've been away with work.

The examples at Beverley and Dulverton definitely are extensions and not the original buildings. I'm not sure of the extensions' age but it is the principle & similarity of these examples to our own situation that I am trying to demonstrate.

Could we perhaps have another telephone conversation when you are available to catch up on where we now are. My contact number is 07592 794365.

Thanks

Cliff

On 4 Apr 2018, at 14:32, Charlotte Spencer <cspencer2@hillingdon.gov.uk> wrote:

Hi Cliff,

I have quickly looked at those examples. Beverley Road and Dulverton Road have no site history for any extensions suggesting that these are original and not extended. As such, they cannot be used as precedent. Filey Way is a new house and not an extension and was approved 13 years ago and as such Policy would have changed. In addition, all of these examples are not within the immediate surrounding area and street scene. As such, I do not believe these are strong enough arguments for your proposal.

Kind Regards
Charlotte

On 29 March 2018 at 15:28, Cliff Patch <cliff.patch@blueyonder.co.uk> wrote:
Hi Charlotte,

Thanks for your response. As I mentioned when I sent those examples through to you, I had additional examples but needed to revisit the properties to get the addresses for you.

I've now done this and additional examples of extensions crossing a return building line are [1 Beverley Road](#) & 2 Beverley Road. Both of these are exactly the same situation as our own. Both properties are on the same angle to the road as ours and the distances from the extensions to the return adjacent properties are broadly the same or less than ours.

In addition, the property adjoining 2 [Beverley Road \(85 Dulverton Road\)](#) also has an extension that crosses the return building line and there is a further example at [11 Filey Waye](#). I have photos of each property should you need them.

Again, I'd ask you to consider these examples as I believe they represent completely the principles of what we are looking to agree for our own extension.

Many thanks

Cliff

On 28 Mar 2018, at 15:43, Charlotte Spencer <cspencer2@hillington.gov.uk> wrote:

Hi Cliff,

I had reviewed the examples, however they cannot be used as precedent for your case. In your situation the house is at an angle to the main roads, whereas the others are along junctions. In the examples you gave the return building lines were further away as the whole of the rear gardens separated them, whereas in your case, the return building line is very close to the extension. I spoke to a manager who suggested that it may be best to gain approval for the single storey extensions to allow this to happen now and then at a later stage review if and how the property can be extended at first floor.

Kind Regards
Charlotte

On 28 March 2018 at 10:08, Cliff Patch <cliff.patch@blueyonder.co.uk> wrote:
Hi Charlotte,

Just a quick follow up to see if you had had a chance to consider the examples I sent through?

Also, whilst writing, I confirm our conversation that I'm OK if the period for a decision needs to be extended by a few weeks recognising the Easter break coming up and the on-going dialogue between us.

Hopefully we'll speak again soon.

Thanks

Cliff

On 22 Mar 2018, at 12:18, Cliff Patch <cliff.patch@blueyonder.co.uk> wrote:

Hi Charlotte,

Thanks for the call earlier.

The building line example we discussed is at 327 Victoria Road and there appears to be another at 9 Woodlands Avenue. Both of these are currently in the process of being built.

I have some photographs of other examples I have found in the area and we can look at these if necessary.

Thanks

Cliff

On 21 Mar 2018, at 12:38, Cliff Patch <cliff.patch@blueyonder.co.uk> wrote:

Hi Charlotte,

The person I believe we spoke to is Nicola Taplin on 25th October 2017 at 10.30am. The appointment ref was 41541500. I've attached a copy of the confirmation to help.

Will wait for your call on Thursday but is there an alternative opportunity to come and see you? Talking through face to face with a drawing open would help me.

Thanks

Cliff

<Booking Confirmation.eml>

On 20 Mar 2018, at 16:25, Charlotte Spencer <cspencer2@hillingdon.gov.uk> wrote:

Hi Cliff,

I am out of the office tomorrow but I will give you a call on Thursday. Can you confirm the name of the person that you spoke to?

Thanks
Charlotte

On 20 March 2018 at 15:41, Cliff Patch <cpatch@blueyonder.co.uk> wrote:

Hi Charlotte,

Apologies I missed your call, I'm away on business today. I would however like the opportunity to discuss the proposal further with you.

I am back home tomorrow (Wed) and for the rest of the week so could either call you or take your call to suit your timings.

Ideally though, it would be good to talk through some of the points you've made face to face as I'd find this easier and we could discuss some points that came up in the pre submission meeting I had with your colleague.

If you let me know some timings for when you'll be available either way, I'll reorganise myself to fit in.

Thanks

Cliff

On 20 Mar 2018, at 09:41, Charlotte Spencer <cspencer2@hillingdon.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Mr Patch,

Apologies for the delay in getting back to you. The messaging system was down on Friday and I got caught up yesterday. I did just attempt to call you but there was no answer.

I have reviewed the application and currently I would be recommending for refusal for the following reasons:

The side extension is very large. It is noted that some properties in the area have similar size extensions in regards to the width but this is at ground floor only. The wide ground floor extension in conjunction with the two storey side extension which fails to comply with Hillingdon Design and Accessibility Statement's (HDAS) recommendations of a set back on 1 metre and set down of 0.5 metres. Therefore it is considered that the proposal would fail to appear subordinate.

As your property is on a corner it is important that the two storey side extension does not project forward of the return building line. The two storey extension would be built forward of the established building line along Windermere Avenue by 3.1 metres and so it is considered it is not in keeping with the street scene.

The amenity space following development would be 60 sqm and so does not meet the requirements of 100sqm for a 4-bed dwelling. The extension would involve the loss of half the existing amenity space and would involve an increase in bedrooms. Therefore, it is considered that insufficient amenity space would be retained and the site would be overdeveloped.

There is no issue with the porch and it would be acceptable in regards to the neighbouring properties.

To allow this application to be approved I believe too many changes would occur to continue on this application as the description would need to be changed and therefore new consultations to occur. Please remember your right to appeal.

Note this is officer opinion only and does not necessarily represent the final views of the Council.

If you would still like me to give you a call please reply by email as I receive these messages quicker than the phone messages and I will attempt to give you a call.

Kind Regards

--

Charlotte Spencer
Planning Officer
Resident Services | London Borough of Hillingdon
3N, Civic Centre | London Borough of Hillingdon

Tel: 01895 250230

Planning Guarantee

Hillingdon are committed to ensure the best possible service provision to all of our applicants. In order to ensure this, we will not be able to facilitate negotiation which would result in an application being determined outside of statutory timeframes, unless the applicant has entered into a Planning Performance Agreement.

Hillingdon Council routinely monitors the content of emails sent and received via its network for the purposes of ensuring compliance with its policies and procedures. The contents of this message are for the attention and use of the intended addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient or addressee, or the person responsible for sending the message you may not copy, forward, disclose or otherwise use it or any part of it in any way. To do so may be unlawful. If you receive this email by mistake please advise the sender immediately. Where opinions are expressed they are not necessarily those of the London Borough of Hillingdon. Service by email is not accepted unless by prior agreement.

--