



NEXT PHASE

THE TOWN PLANNING EXPERTS

Submission to the Planning Inspectorate

Statement of Case due to the refusal of planning permission in accordance with
Section 78(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Local Planning Authority: The Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon
Application No: 4813/APP/2019/3502

Statement of Case to the Planning Inspectorate for part two storey part single storey
side extension and conversion garage to habitable use, single storey rear extension and
single storey front extension at 2 Chichester Avenue, Ruislip, HA4 7EH

STATEMENT OF CASE

On behalf of Irene Ting

March 2020



0768/01

Statement of Case – 4813/APP/2019/3502

STATEMENT OF CASE

Statement of Case to the Planning Inspectorate for part two storey part single storey side extension and conversion garage to habitable use, single storey rear extension and single storey front extension at 2 Chichester Avenue, Ruislip, HA4 7EH

Irene Ting

March 2020

Author	Christopher Whitehouse MRICS BSc (Hons) RICS Accredited Expert Witness Chartered Planning and Development Surveyor
--------	---

Report Status	Final
Date of Issue	March 2020
DISTRIBUTION	
Date	Issued To:
March 2020	Planning Inspectorate
March 2020	NextPhase Development Ltd
March 2020	Irene Ting
N.B	This report has been produced by NextPhase Development Ltd within the terms of the contract with the client and taking account of the resources devoted to it by agreement with the client's representatives. We disclaim any responsibility to the client and others in respect of matters outside the scope of the above. We accept no responsibility of whatsoever nature to third parties to who this report, or part thereof, is made known. NextPhase Development Limited Registered in England and Wales No: 7525574.

CONTENTS

Item	Description
1.0	Introduction
2.0	Statement of Case
3.0	Conditions of Planning

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Statement of Case has been prepared for the attention of the Planning Inspectorate in accordance with Section 78(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 on behalf of the appellant, Irene Ting.
- 1.2 This report provides a statement of case against the refusal of planning permission issued by The Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon (*"Hillingdon Council"*) on 27th December 2019 in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.
- 1.3 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a part two storey part single storey side extension, the conversion of a garage to habitable use, a single storey rear extension and a single storey front extension to the property known as 2 Chichester Avenue, Ruislip, HA4 7EH.
- 1.4 This statement provides a clear explanation of the statement of case and directly responds to the reason for refusal issued by Hillingdon Council within their Decision Notice.
- 1.5 This appeal has been prepared with the intention of appealing via the written representations route and refers to documentation throughout that formed part of the application submission and is noted in the appeal submission documentation list as appropriate.

2.0 STATEMENT OF CASE

2.1 Reason for Refusal

Hillingdon Council refused the application for a single reason which is contested by the appellant and as such the statement of case against the reason for refusal is outlined within this chapter.

2.2 Reason for Refusal 1 Detail

“The proposed part two, part single storey extension, by reason of its siting in this visually prominent position, its projection forward of the building line along Chichester Avenue, lack of a set in at first floor from the side boundary would be an incongruous addition to the host dwelling and would fail to appear subordinate. In addition the loss of the hung tiles and proposed rendered finish to the gable ends would dramatically alter the appearance of the original dwelling and would result in the property appearing starkly different to other similar properties in the streetscene.

Consequently the proposals would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the adjacent Ruislip Village Conservation Area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012), Policies DMHD1, DMHB4 and DMHB11 of the emerging Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies with Modifications (March 2019) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions”.

2.3 It is the appellant's case that the proposal, by way of the introduction of its extensions maintains a proportionate and reasonable provision of built development that is in

- accordance with the surrounding character and appearance of the streetscene as it can be applied and brings forward the provision of a high quality family home for the benefit of localised housing stock.
- 2.4 It is the Council's consideration that the proposed extensions offer harm by way of the visually prominent position and due to a failure of the side extension to appear subordinate to the host dwelling.
- 2.5 However it is the Appellant's case that the proposed extensions in this regard are proportionate to the landholding given to the host dwelling; the extensions appear reasonable and commensurate to the general prevailing streetscene pattern of properties found southwards along its streetscene; do not extend further forwards from it and offers a rear extension that retains a relatively consistent built core without impacting upon residential amenity to the host or surrounding neighbours.
- 2.6 Whilst the side extension offers a lack of subservience with regard predominantly to its delivery it nonetheless retains visual relief space with regard to the space given over to the ground floor side extension and its relationship with the neighbouring boundary so as to reduce any potential relative impact of dominance created by its delivery.
- 2.7 The by-product of the introduction of the side extension that is not subservient to the front elevation aesthetic is the provision of a balanced aesthetic, one that mirrors the existing gable and existing roof span so as to provide an attractive and satisfactorily proportionate dwelling that provides balance within its own setting.
- 2.8 From the north side elevation of the property, whereupon it could be expected that any prominence with relation to its corner position would be most felt, the proposed
-

- elevations demonstrate a lack of distinct change with regard to the massing and appearance of the proposal from this locality.
- 2.9 It is considered therefore that the impact of the development with regard to the character and appearance of the surrounding area is negligible in relation to the considerations raised by the authority within their Decision Notice.
- 2.10 With regard to the consideration of the proposed visual changes to the materiality of the property and such impact upon the adjacent Ruislip Village Conservation Area; it is not clear to which prevailing pattern of materiality the proposed dwelling is meant to abide by so as to accord with planning policy in this regard.
- 2.11 The proposal brings forward a balanced and reasonable provision of works that maintain consistency with material elements associated with the extant dwellings; whilst the proposal would result in a loss of hung tiles in some locations; it nonetheless introduces a rendered finish that can be found within the locality.
- 2.12 The Development Plan that can be applied to the site and the surrounding area does not provide specificity with regard to the appropriate materials to be provided within the site and as such consideration should be given as to whether the proposal offers any material harm by way of its introduction or delivery that is not outweighed by the benefits of the proposal.
- 2.13 In this regard it is considered that the introduction of the scale of development and use of its materials offers negligible harm and certainly not any harm that sufficiently outweighs the benefits afforded to the improvements associated with family homes by
-

way of high quality residential extensions that improve the quality of the housing stock with regards to improved internal provisions of space.

2.14 In this regard therefore the proposal accords with the Development Plan as it can be applied and as such is in accordance with Policies BE1, BE4, BE13, BE15 and BE19 together with Policies DMHD1, DMHB4 and DMHB11 as they can be applied in response to their use within the reason for refusal.

2.15 Overall therefore it is respectfully requested that the appeal is upheld and planning permission is granted for the proposal.

3.0 CONDITIONS OF PLANNING

- 3.1 It is considered that the standardised conditions with regards to timeframes and plans should be adopted. Pre-commencement conditions to confirm the specification of facing materials is also considered to be reasonable and appropriate.

(This page is intentionally blank)



www.nextphasedevelopment.co.uk

Head Office: 8 Bore Street, Lichfield, Staffordshire, WS13 6LL
Tel: 01543 571718 | Email: c.whitehouse@nextphasedevelopment.co.uk

London Office: 16 Upper Woburn Place, London, WC1H 0BS
Tel: 0203 741 8225 | Email: c.whitehouse@nextphasedevelopment.co.uk

Company No: 7525574. | VAT No: 156185595 | Registered in England and Wales



NEXT PHASE

THE TOWN PLANNING EXPERTS

HEAD OFFICE:

NextPhase Development Ltd
8 Bore Street
Lichfield
Staffordshire
WS13 6LL
tel: 01543 571718

LONDON OFFICE:

NextPhase Development Ltd
16 Upper Woburn Place
London
WC1H 0BS
tel: 0203 741 8225



mail@nextphasedevelopment.co.uk
www.nextphasedevelopment.co.uk