

103 Lime Grove - Planning Appeal Statement

The rejection of the planning application at 103 Lime Grove has been addressed with a design change that addresses each of the issues that were raised with one exception – the total width of the roof dormer which has not been reduced.

These statements refer back to comments made in the Officers Report

1 - Considerations

1.1 & 1.2

An error was made in the site boundary, which was wrongly shown to include the shared access path that belongs to 101 Lime Grove. This pathway is separate to the land owned by 103 Lime Grove and has been shown on the amended drawings that have been submitted as part of the appeal. The data obtained from the Ordnance Survey National Geographic Database shows the corrected distance from the boundary to the proposed building as being 0.93m at the minimum distance along the length. The design proposed in this appeal has been brought in by 0.07m to bring the design to 1m from the boundary at the second story. All drawings attached show the new boundary line.

The path is to be retained with the access being retained through either the existing or a reinstated gate.

1.3

Responses from Neighbours

The planning applications made in 2019 and 2020 were sent to 6 neighbours and the Eastcote Residents Association for comment. During the total 6 weeks planning consulting phase there were no comments either for or against the proposed design.

This shows lack of opposition to the design, despite the rejection of the application.

5 – Main planning issues

99 Lime Grove has double story extension that is against the boundary and the design at 103 Lime Grove mimics this design

103 Lime Grove has been rejected due to the design being less than 1m from the boundary at all heights, however in argument the double story side extension at 99 Lime Grove is built against the property boundary. The design at 103 reflects this design

The original proposal was for an amended roofline at an angle of 44 degrees compared to the existing 39 degrees. The resubmission has the original roofline angle, however the proposed dormer has not been reduced in width but has a chamfered roofline to ensure that it does not stick out past the roofline. It is not possible to reduce the roofline of the dormer the entire length due to the headroom in the loft. The angled part of the roof will be tiled to match the dormer to reduce the impact of the design.

Reducing the width of the dormer will not allow for adequate internal space to provide a bedroom and an en-suite.

The roofline being kept the same as the original will help maintain the existing look of the building as a whole and will not detract from the neighbourhood.

6 – Recommendation

1 – Non Standard reason for refusal

The two storey side extension is no longer overly large, does not affect the gradient of the roofline of the property and is no longer over the 1m mark from the boundary. This will help keep it in line with the character of the adjacent properties and the visual amenities of the street scene.

2 – Non Standard reason for refusal

The roof design has been slightly modified to reduce the impact of the design on the architectural look of the property.

3 – Non Standard reason for refusal

The design change now means that the gap to the boundary for the two storey side extension no longer exists.

The side extension at the rear of the property is not included in the design (detailed below), which means the overall distance between the 103 Lime Grove and 105 Lime Grove has actually increased.

Other changes

Other changes in the design include the removal of the ground floor side extension that protruded from the rear of the property. It has now been changed to a single storey rear extension of external dimensions 5.465 x 2m with a parapet style flat roof.

This change has resulted in a different rear elevation, where the bi-fold doors have been moved from the LHS to the RHS (facing), the other window on the rear elevation moved from the RHS to the LHS and enlarged as it is no longer limited by the height of the worktop in the kitchen.

An additional window has been added on the side elevation of the newly proposed rear extension.

Conclusion

It is believed that these changes will bring the design to within the design guidance policies that it was originally rejected for.

List of amendments to drawings

101B

01

- Boundary line corrected
- Proposed design highlighted in blue

02

- Boundary line corrected

03

- No change

04

- Boundary line corrected

05

- Boundary line corrected
- Proposed design highlighted in blue

102B

01

- Boundary line corrected

02

- No change

03

- New rear extension shown in section

103B

01

- Boundary line corrected
- Building reduced in width to keep 1m from new boundary line
- Side protrusion removed. Property now extended to rear with flat

02

- Boundary line corrected

03

- Side extension removed and new rear extension shown

04

- Boundary line corrected
- New rear extension. Large doors moved from RHS to LHS of property
- Proposed window enlarged as no longer limited by height of kitchen worktops

104B

01

- New rear extension shown in section with building information

02

- No change

105B

01

- New roof shown

02

- No change

106B

01

- No change

02

- New rear extension shown