



Final comments of the Appellant

“Demolition of an existing 2-bed bungalow and erection of a new 4-bedroom bungalow with habitable roof space, including side dormer, raising the ridge of the main roof, roof lights and solar panels.”

Site Address: 14 Larne Road, HA4 8DR, Ruislip, Hillingdon, Middlesex

Planning Application Reference: 57311/APP/2022/3104

Appeal Reference: APP/R5510/W/23/3318855

Date: August 2023

1. Introduction

The Appellant is in receipt of the statement of case provided by London Borough of Hillingdon LPA and would make the following comments in respect of the points raised by the LPA.

2. Comments

-) Para 1.5 – LPA refers to planning approval being granted to application ref. 57311/APP/2023/322 which is a subsequent application we have submitted following refusal of the appealed application (ref.: 57311/APP/2022/3104). Please note that within our initial statement we refer to the same application as an example of how flexible we could have been with design changes if the planning officer was willing to establish dialog that could lead to a satisfactory conclusion. Following refusal of the first application (which unfortunately was delayed by a month), to avoid further delays, we had no choice but to submit a new application with changes imposed on us by the refusal, to secure planning permission for a design that is almost identical in scale. Several elements have been altered on planning officers request like:
- a) removal of the south side ‘lean to’ element or
 - b) straightening the front wall
 - c) reduction of number of PV solar panels by 50% (which makes the scheme much less energy efficient)
 - d) relocation of one rooflight from southern side making it less ‘busy’ (here we would be happy to maintain this change (possibly under condition) to create more space for PV panels if this was preferable).
- We would be happy with most these design alterations, however what we cannot agree with is the removal of the timber cladding and timber shutters which we believe will bring nothing but positive, modern touch to a traditional bungalow house.

-) Para 1.6 & 1.7 – Sample photos of selected houses on Larne Road included within our initial statement were to demonstrate a variety of forms and shapes of properties at Larne Road. There are houses with openable rooflights, dormers, porches, side, and rear extensions. It is the ‘variety’ that creates the ‘harmony’. There are black timber accentuations on every other house together with timber cladding (white) on front elevation of two of the houses no.3 and no 8.
Please note that we are also proposing to use white render together with black timber cladding on the front elevation to maintain the harmony of the design.
-) Para 1.8 – LPA states: *“ The Appellant has presented examples of timber cladded properties located in the broader locality of the site. However, it is important to note that none of these properties are situated on Larne Road, and their architectural characteristics cannot be directly compared to the appeal site. Therefore, very limited weight should be afforded to these examples, as they are not directly comparable to the specific context of Larne Road. ”*
– Please note that Larne Road is a small street. Examples shown within our initial statement are located just off the Larne Road and are noticeable immediately at the street’s junction. The context is therefore very clear and should not be disregarded.
-) Para 1.9 – LPA opinion on proposed design is subjective. Our proposed front elevation contains all elements one would expect from a traditional house. There is a ,bay window’ at ground floor that aligns with existing building line (and also no.16) and the recessed entrance (rendered) that aligns with existing building line (and also no. 12). The modern intervention is to create transition between the neighbouring buildings with an angled wall. The angled wall has such subtle angle that would not dominate the street but create a rather positive interest.
It is noticeable across the Hillingdon Borough that LPA allows modern architectural interventions within its’ boundaries, hence our scepticism with regards to subjective opinions like the one presented within the LPA statement. We are architects with ample experience. We would like to create our own house that is both elegant with modern feel and which also corresponds well with street settings and area characteristics.
-) Para 1.10 – LPA refers to ‘busy appearance’ of the design to include:
- Choice of material - there are only two materials being proposed timber and render as used elsewhere withing the street and the area.
 - Angled first floor – as above, this is a very subtle angle which would be hardly visible unless one stands close by.
 - Multiple roof profiles - As mentioned above there is a huge variety of forms and shapes of roofs on the street. This comment should be irrelevant.
 - Solar panels – this comment is inappropriate with all houses on the street being allowed to exercise their permitted development rights for solar panels. It is within council’s policies to promote reduction of carbon emissions. We can only expect more solar panels being installed on the street facing roofs in the future. Will we be the only house without the privilege of having access to solar energy? Should this be a privilege or necessity?
-) Para 1.11 – As mentioned above the scale of the proposal has been already approved by the LPA within subsequent planning approval re.: 57311/APP/2023/322. Therefore, this comment should be disregarded.

) Para 1.12 – With above comments, it has been proven that proposed design would not cause harm but would enhance the character, appearance and visual amenity of the street scene. The design is with accordance with Local Planning Policies.

) Para 1.13 & 1.14 – We welcome the fact that LPA dismisses these grounds for refusal.

3. Conclusion

The appellant contends that the proposal would be in accordance with national, regional and local planning policies and guidance.

The council's reasons for refusal are not well founded and the Inspector is respectfully requested to allow this appeal and grant planning application.

4. Planning Conditions

If the appeal is allowed.

As mentioned above a subsequent planning application has been submitted and permission has been granted for almost identical scheme (with only minor esthetical alterations as described above). List of conditions proposed here by LPA is identical to the one issued within approved planning permission.

Please note that all pre-commencement conditions, listed by LPA here, have already been discharged by the council under the following applications:

- 57311/APP/2023/1099 (For condition 3 and 7)
Condition 3 – Demolition and Construction Management Plan – approved.
Condition 7 – Tree Protection Plan – approved.
- 57311/APP/2023/1579 (for condition 4, 5, 6 and 12)
Condition 4 – Sustainable Water Management and Water Efficiency – approved.
Condition 5 – Materials (including black timber cladding to the rear) – approved.
Condition 7 – Landscape and Planting and Maintenance Schedule – approved.
Condition 12 – Step Free Access Plan – approved.

As the works have now commenced on site (and information provided for the above conditions would be identical), we would like to request for those conditions to be removed from the list or approved by default within your decision.

In addition, we would like the following, proposed by LPA conditions, to be removed from the list of conditions as we believe they are not truly justified.

- Condition 10
“Any rooflights in the side roof slopes of the development hereby approved below a height of 1.8 metres taken from internal finished floor level shall be glazed with permanently obscured glass to at least scale 4 on the Pilkington scale and be non-opening for so long as the development remains in existence. REASON: To prevent overlooking to adjoining properties in accordance with Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020). ”

- Condition 14
'Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England)Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional windows, doors or other openings shall be constructed in the walls or roof slopes of the development hereby approved facing Nos. 12 or 16 Larne Road. REASON: To prevent overlooking to adjoining properties in accordance with policy DMHB11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020).''
- Condition 15
Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development)(England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification); no garage(s), shed(s) or other outbuilding(s), nor extension or roof alteration to any dwellinghouse shall be erected without the grant of further specific permission from the Local Planning Authority. REASON: To protect the character and appearance of the area and amenity of residential occupiers in accordance with policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 2 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 (2020), "

REASON: Existing house, that we propose to demolish, is in a very poor condition. It was a reasonable approach to choose a full planning application for a new built house rather than Householder application for refurbishment - to make sure the house is energy efficient and designed comprehensively rather than building around remains of existing fabric.

This application would similarly be allowed under Householder Application as established under Pre-Application made last year.

Within householder application Permitted Development Rights would not have been revoked and therefore the above conditions would not apply.

Full planning application allows us to enhance the performance of the building and we feel we should not be punished by imposed conditions 10, 14 and 15 and we therefore request for those conditions to be removed from the list of conditions within your decision.