

APPEAL PROCESS

During the planning application process the Hillingdon Council Planning Team did not enter into any discussions with the architect about potential amendments to the planning application in order to avoid a straight refusal. In reception of the Planning refusal this application went to Committee which refused on the same grounds without allowing us to make any changes which would also be difficult since the reasons for refusal are subjective and not totally clear

We don't agree with the reasons for refusal, namely:

Streetscene

There is no impact from the streetscene due to the position of the house, the landscaping and the side extension is set back from the main elevation and we are keeping the current footprint at the front with the exception of the new front porch that extends 80cm from the current one. This is enough to allow us to have a straight entrance instead of diagonal.

By proposing some new materials like cladding we aim to modernize the property and it's overall looks. The front elevation also proposes to convert the garage but within the existing space. Looking at both elevations – current and proposed we strongly believe that the last one is more appealing and, as referenced above we are not extending in this area, just reconfiguring and using current front already constructed area

Distance to side boundary

The Council Design and Accessibility Statement for Residential Extensions establishes that buildings of 2 or more storeys are to be set back a minimum of 1 metre from the boundary. As we were proposing to build on top of the existing garage footprint the 1st floor extension would be approx. 90cm from the nearest point of the boundary on the corner. The impact would be minimum but we are now proposing to set back this extension by 1 metre from the end of the current garage wall. So the nearest distance to the boundary would be approx. 1.2m.

Daylight/ Sunlight

It has been mentioned that we were not in compliance with the 45 degree line from the first floor. However we have responded to this as there are 4 windows on the first floor of number 30. Please see application ref 53167/APP/2016/96. The 2 nearest to my client are ensembles. The one next (further from my client) is a landing and the last one is a family bathroom. Therefore there are no habitable room windows here so we are in compliance with the sunlight/ daylight. However as per above we are proposing to reduce the size of the first floor extension. At ground floor we will not be extending on this side so there is no increase or loss of sunlight/ daylight, overshadow, etc

Depth

We understand that the guidelines stipulate that a rear extension shouldn't be more than 4m from the original house but, we are also aware that these are just guidelines so each case should be appreciated by itself. There is no impact on neighbours and, in fact, the only area that we are extending is on the left side of the property. We were proposing to extend 6.00m but we are happy to reduce this to be in line with the current garage, while reducing the 1st floor extension, allowing us to get a roof on top of the ground floor, more sympathetic with the neighbouring properties and overall design

Height and Roof design

At the moment the current house already has some flat roofs that are not in accordance with the Design guidelines that establish that these should be avoided. By reducing the 1st floor extension by 1 metre above current garage and approx. 1.95m from the current proposed extension on the opposite side the proposed crown roof will also be reduced massively and still more sympathetic than any flat roofs. Any of the proposed roofs are subordinate to the main existing roof with its ridge lower