



18 The Broadwalk, Northwood

Full Statement of Case

April 2023

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This Full Statement of Case provides support an appeal against the refusal of planning application reference 485/APP/2023/128 at 18 The Broadwalk, Northwood, for the erection of a single storey extension at the rear of the existing garage.
- 1.2 The Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon refused planning permission on 8th March 2023 for application 485/APP/2023/128, on the following grounds:
 1. *The proposed extension by reason of its size, scale, bulk and depth, would form a disproportionate and unsympathetic form of development that would fail preserve the character and appearance of the Copsewood Estate Area of Special Local Character and harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 5, DMHB 6 , DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020).*
 2. *The proposed extension by reason of its size, siting, scale, depth and proximity to the shared boundary, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers at 20 The Broadwalk by causing a harmful sense of enclosure, reading as an overbearing rear addition and resulting in overdominance, particularly to principle areas amenity areas of the rear garden. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020).*
- 1.3 This Full Statement of Case provides a description of the appeal site, relevant planning history, details of the proposed development, planning policy context and scrutiny of the Council's reason for refusal. It also seeks to provide additional justification to support the appeal scheme and the grant of planning permission.
- 1.4 A copy of the application plans that were refused permission are included in **Appendix A**.

2.0 Site Context, Surrounding Area and Proposed Development

- 2.1 The appeal site is an existing detached dwelling located on the north side of The Broadwalk, a suburban residential area to the south west of Northwood and to the north of Ruislip Woods. The area is known as the Copse Wood Estate and is designated an Area of Special Local Character in the Council's Adopted Local Plan. The existing property is a typical suburban detached property of its era, constructed of brickwork and roof tiles. The area including the appeal site generally comprises of low density, large detached properties within spacious plots. Properties are set back from the roadside with parking areas and gardens at the front of the properties, and wide and deep back gardens.

2.2 Planning permission has been applied for a single storey rear extension to the west side of the dwelling to the rear of the existing garage. The proposed extension will be 7.9m deep from the existing rear elevation of the garage and will be 5.7m wide. The design of the rear extension will continue the existing flat roof section of the garage, which itself has a dummy pitch roof at the front of the garage and which is visible in the street scene. The height of the flat roofed extension will be the same as the existing garage at 2.84m above ground level.

2.3 The application form confirms the materials for the extension will include:

- Brick walls to match the existing house.
- GRP roof with dark grey edging fascias to match existing.
- Black aluminium framed sliding patio door system to match existing.

2.4 The patio doors are located in the northern rear elevation and eastern side elevation facing into the garden area of the property. No windows are proposed in the western elevation. Western wall of the extension is adjacent to the western side boundary of the appeal site with No.20. There will be a small gap of 200mm between the western boundary of the site and proposed western elevation of the extension.

3.0 Relevant Planning History

3.1 The officer's delegated report for the planning application sets out the full planning history for No.18 dating back to 1979. Permissions have been granted in the past to extend the property over time, which have been constructed.

3.2 Of particular relevance to this appeal is a Certificate of Lawfulness for a Proposed Development granted in April 2022 under reference 485/APP/2022/396 for the erection of an outbuilding in exactly the same location, apart from a gap of 0.815m between the outbuilding and the rear elevation of the existing dwelling. A copy of the approved plans, officer's report and decision notice is included in **Appendix B**.

3.3 This Certificate of Lawfulness of Proposed development confirmed that the proposed outbuilding constituted permitted development by virtue of the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. (as amended).

3.4 Whilst the approved plan for this Certificate of Lawfulness shows a gap of 0.815m between the house and outbuilding, the overall projected depth, width, position and height of the approved outbuilding from the back of the garage is the same as the rear extension proposed in this appeal.

3.5 It is also noted that the officer in their report for reference 485/APP/2022/396 makes the following assessment in section 2.0:

The proposed use of the outbuilding as a games room is considered to be reasonably required for incidental purposes; there are no bathroom or kitchen facilities. The outbuilding would have a footprint of 40.6.sq.m. It is considered that the scale of the outbuilding appears proportionate to the scale of the original dwellinghouse.

- 3.6 Of particular note is the reference in the above extract to the outbuilding appearing proportionate to the scale of the original dwellinghouse. This statement and granting of the Certificate of Lawfulness is a material consideration in determining this appeal.
- 3.7 Taking into account the extension projects the same distance back from the property as the outbuilding, the same conclusion should be arrived at in respect of this appeal in terms of the previous comment made by the Council's case officer. This clearly states that from a design, size and scale point of view the proposed permitted development does not appear out of character in relation to the existing property.
- 3.8 It should also be taken into account that the Certificate of Lawfulness has created a fallback position that forms a material consideration in relation to this current planning application. The acceptability and material impact of a fallback position was confirmed in *Mansell v Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council* ([2016] EWHC 2832 (Admin)), where Mr Justice Garnham confirmed that 'appropriate regard must be had to material planning considerations including the permitted development fallback position'. As such, the permitted development established under 485/APP/2022/396, should be taken into account in determining this planning application and sets the principles for allowing this size, scale and position of extension proposed.
- 3.9 Whilst the officer's delegated report mentions the 2022 Certificate of Lawfulness outbuilding approval in the history section of the report, there is no mention of this approval with the "Main Planning Issues". On this basis, it is clear that the officers gave this decision no weight in the decision making process other than referencing it within the history section of the report.
- 3.10 It should be noted that during the application (subject of this appeal), a letter prepared by PJB Planning Ltd was sent on behalf of the applicant at 17:09 on 8th March 2023 to the Council ahead of the expiry date of the application which was 10th March 2023. A copy of this email and attached letter and plan are included in **Appendix C**. The letter attached to this email set out further planning justification for approving the application including:
 - a) The Certificate of Lawfulness approved for the outbuilding under reference 485/APP/2022/396.
 - b) A review of the impact on the neighbours at No. 16 and 20 Broadwalk, which also took into account a recent permission granted at No.20 for a two storey side extension beside the boundary with No.18 (LPA reference 14514/APP/2021/3550).

- c) Comparable properties in the locality that have had similar extensions approved and constructed.

3.11 It would appear from the officer's report for reference 485/APP/2023/128 (subject of this appeal) there was no mention of this letter that was submitted and as such it is assumed the Council did not take into account these points raised prior to issuing their decision notice.

4.0 Planning Policy Context

4.1 The following section highlights the Local Plan planning policies, which the proposal at No.18 The Broadwalk were deemed to conflict with by the Council, and which are subsequently referred to in the Council's reason for refusal. A list of the policies referred to are included in **Appendix D**.

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (adopted November 2012)

- 4.2 The Reason for Refusal refers to the following Adopted Local Plan: Part One policies:
- 4.3 *Policy BE1: Built Environment* – This policy provides strategic design guidance ensuring that all new development improves and maintains the quality of the built environment. The policy seeks to achieve a high quality design in all new extensions. Criteria 1 and 2 are more aligned towards considering development that will impact on a "sense of place" and "local area". Criteria 2 does require the protection of the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, including residential properties.
- 4.4 *Policy HE1: Heritage* – Policy HE1 seeks to conserve and enhance Hillingdon's distinct and varied environment, its settings and the wider historic landscape. Map 7.1 which relates to Policy HE1 shows Conservations Areas, Area of Special Local Character, Schedule Ancient Monuments, Archaeological Priority Areas and Zones (existing and proposed). The appeal site falls within the Copsewood Estate, Northward Area of Special Local Character. There is however no specific reference to Areas of Special Local Character within Policy HE1, although it does refer to "*planned residential estates*".
- 4.5 The Council's website provide details of the Areas of Special Local Character (ASLC) in Hillingdon, including a date they were designated and a map of the designation. It should also be noted that there is no character appraisal that has been prepared for the Copsewood Estate by the Council. The following link to the relevant webpage confirms the Council's list of Areas of Special Local Character and a provides a map of the Copsewood Estate ASLC:

<https://www.hillingdon.gov.uk/article/5982/Areas-of-special-local-character>

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (January 2020)

- 4.6 The Reason for Refusal refers to the following Adopted Local Plan: Part Two policies:
- 4.7 *Policy DMHB 1: Heritage Assets* – This policy provides guidance in relation to the impact on heritage assets. Whilst there is a question over the validity of the Copsewood Estate designation as an Area of Special Local Character, this policy provides further guidance in relation to the consideration of developments within these designations. In relation to extension's part iv) requires that they are designed in sympathy, without detracting from or competing with the heritage asset, and part v) requires that proposals should relate appropriately in terms of siting, style, scale, massing, height, design and materials.
- 4.8 *Policy DMHB 5: Areas of Special Local Character* – Paragraph 5.17 of the Local Plan: Part Two provides more information about designation and quality of Areas of Special Local Character and states:
- "They are chosen on the basis of their local architectural, townscape or historic merit, which helps mark and celebrate the area's special quality. The criteria for ASLCs differ from Conservation Area selection criteria in that they recognise particularly good examples of more familiar types of development as opposed to the more outstanding quality required for Conservation Area designation."*
- 4.9 Paragraph 5.18 goes onto state in relation to extensions:
- Within Areas of Special Local Character new development should complement existing materials, design features, architectural style and building heights predominant in the area. Extensions to dwellings should respect the symmetry of the original buildings and be subordinate in nature.*
- 4.10 Criteria B) of Policy DMHB 5 states that extensions within these designated areas, *"should be subservient to, and respect the architectural style of the original buildings and allow sufficient space for appropriate landscaping, particularly between, and in front of, buildings."* This policy wording could be read that whilst there is an overall consideration of the impact of an extension on the surrounding area, there is a particular consideration of the impact of a development at the front of the properties.
- 4.11 *Policy DMHB 6: Gatehill Farm Estate and Copse Wood Estate Areas of Special Local Character* – This policy provides design guidance and criteria that are applicable to the consideration of new houses. As this application is for an extension, Policy DMHB 6 is not applicable to the consideration of this appeal.
- 4.12 *Policy DMHB 11: Design of New Development* – This policy requires all new extensions to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design, taking into account:

- The scale of development, considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures.
- Building plot sizes and widths, plot coverage and established street patterns.
- Building lines and setbacks, rooflines, streetscape rhythm.
- Architectural composition and quality of detailing.
- Views both from and to the site.
- The use of high quality building materials and finishes.
- Protecting un-designated assets and their settings.
- Development should not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties.

4.13 *Policy DMHD 1: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings* – This policy provides detailed guidance in relation to the consideration and design of extensions to residential properties. Of particular relevance to this appeal are the following criteria:

- There should be no adverse cumulative impact of the proposal on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area.
- A satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is to be achieved.
- New extensions should appear subordinate to the main dwelling in their floor area, width, depth and height.
- New extensions should respect the design of the original house and be of matching materials.
- There should be no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.
- Adequate garden space should be retained.
- All extensions in Areas of Special Local Character should be designed in keeping with the original house, in terms of layout, scale, proportions, roof form, window pattern, detailed design and materials.
- Single storey rear extensions to detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or more should not exceed 4.0 metres in depth.
- Flat roofed single storey extensions should not exceed 3.0 metres in height and any pitched or sloping roofs should not exceed 3.4 metres in height, measured from ground level.
- In Areas of Special Local Character, flat roofed single storey extensions will be expected to be finished with a parapet.

4.14 The officer's report for the application also refers to the following policies in the Local Plan: Part Two, but does not refer to them in the reasons for refusal and as such it is assumed the Council have no objection to the development under these policies:

- DMHB 14 (Trees and Landscaping)
- DMT 2 (Highways Impact)
- DMT 6 (Vehicle Parking)

London Plan 2021

- 4.15 The Council's Reasons for Refusal do not refer to any of the policies contained within the London Plan, although the officer's report does mention the title of the London Plan in the policy section of the report and states the following policies:
- Policy D4 (Delivering good design)
 - Policy D6 Housing quality and standards
- 4.16 In addition to Policy D4 and D6, the inspector's attention is also drawn to London Plan Policy D3 (Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach). This policy emphasises that all development must make best use of land, but must also take into account form and layout, experience and quality and character. In particular, criteria 10), 11) and 12) of Policy D3 states:

Criteria 10

"achieve indoor and outdoor environments that are comfortable and inviting for people to use"

Criteria 11

"respond to the existing character of a place by identifying the special and valued features and characteristics that are unique to the locality and respect, enhance and utilise the heritage assets and architectural features that contribute towards the local character"

Criteria 12

"be of high quality, with architecture that pays attention to detail, and gives thorough consideration to the practicality of use, flexibility, safety and building lifespan through appropriate construction methods and the use of attractive, robust materials which weather and mature well"

- 4.17 It is considered that the proposals at 18 The Broadwalk comply with the requirements of London Plan Policies D3, D4 and D6.

NPPF 2021

- 4.18 The Council's Reasons for Refusal also do not include reference to national planning guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021, which is applicable to the consideration of this appeal, and sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how they are expected to be applied. The NPPF requires the planning system to perform economic, social and

environmental roles (NPPF, Paragraph 8). These three overarching objectives are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways.

- 4.19 At the centre of the adopted NPPF, which sets out Central Government's overarching national strategic planning objectives is a presumption in favour of sustainable development:
- 4.20 *"So that sustainable development is pursued in a positive way, at the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development...For decision taking this means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay..."* (NPPF, para. 10 and 11)
- 4.21 In terms of seeking well-designed places, the NPPF states that:
- 4.22 *"The creation of high-quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities."* (NPPF, para 126)
- 4.23 Paragraph 134 of the NPPF provides guidance on applying local design guidance and states:
- "Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes. Conversely, significant weight should be given to:*
- a) development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes; and/or*
 - b) outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings."*
- 4.24 Paragraph 130 of the NPPF advises that both planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments:
- a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;*
 - b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;*
 - c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);*

- d) *establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;*
- e) *optimise the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount and mix of development (including green and other public space) and support local facilities and transport networks; and*
- f) *create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.*

5.0 Full Statement of Case

Reason for Refusal 1

The proposed extension by reason of its size, scale, bulk and depth, would form a disproportionate and unsympathetic form of development that would fail preserve the character and appearance of the Copsewood Estate Area of Special Local Character and harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 5, DMHB 6, DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020).

- 5.1 The reason for refusal focuses on the size, scale, bulk and depth of the proposed extension. It is these aspects of the extension that are considered by the Council not to “harmonise” with the architectural composition of the original dwelling. It is also these aspects of the extension that the Council consider would form a disproportionate and unsympathetic form that would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Copse Wood Estate ASLC.
- 5.2 The officer’s delegated report also comments that the extension does not comply with the prescribed depth in Policy DMHD 1 of 4 metres, and does not contain a parapet wall being located within an ASLC. The officer also raises concern in their report about the loss of existing soft planting along the boundary with No.20 The Broadwalk and lack of an arboricultural survey and tree report justifying the planting will be retained.
- 5.3 The overall conclusion of the officer’s report of this issue is that the proposed extension would “*harm the character and appearance of the original property as well as the Copsewood Estate ASLC due to its scale, size and siting on top of an already heavily extended rear façade.*”
- 5.4 The officer however makes no mention in Section 5 of their report about the outbuilding proposed under LPA reference 485/APP/2022/396, which could be constructed as permitted development. The appellant would contend this permitted

development is a material consideration in determining this appeal and should be given significant weight.

- 5.5 In relation to the considerations under Local Plan policies, the depth of the extension would be 7.9m, which is beyond the depth of 4m stated within Policy DMHD 1. However, the appellant would make the point that whilst this is policy, it should not be necessarily be strictly applied if there are genuine circumstances as to why an extension is considered acceptable.
- 5.6 In this case the existing property at No.18 is 26.1m wide nearly across the full width of the appeal site. It has a depth from front to back of 13.5m. The ridge height of the existing dwelling is 8.3m. The overall GEA of the footprint of the existing dwelling is 278 sqm.
- 5.7 In comparison to the existing dwelling the extension would have a GEA of 44.18m, which represents an increase of 15.89% over the GEA of the existing properties footprint. It will extend 5.58m beyond the furthest rear wall of the house, and will have a height of 2.7m.
- 5.8 Taking into account the size of the existing property and the size of the proposed extension, the appellant's would contend that the proposed extension is subordinate in size and scale to the existing dwelling.
- 5.9 It is also proposed to use high quality materials to match the existing dwelling and using high quality aluminium framed windows to fenestrate the extension. From within the back garden of the property the extension will enclose the property's patio on one side creating a private area with a high quality appearance.
- 5.10 From outside the site from the front of the property, the rear extension will not be visible as it is set behind the existing garage to the side of the house, which has a dummy pitched roof at the front screening views of the extension. The appeal site is also heavily screened to the rear, with residential properties surrounding the back of the property. The proposed extension will therefore not be visible from any public views from the front, side or back of the property. On this basis, the extension will have no impact of the street scene or public views from outside the site.
- 5.11 The officer highlights that the proposed extension is flat roofed and does not have a parapet wall it contrary to Policy DMHD 1. However, the proposed extension continues the flat roof design of the existing garage, which does not have a parapet. As such, if the extension itself were to include a parapet this would itself be at odds with the design of the front part of the garage that does not have a parapet. As such, in order to comply with the other parts of Policy DMHD 1 and to be inkeeping with the design of the existing dwelling, it is consider that strict adherence to this part of the policy should be waived in this instance.
- 5.12 In relation to the trees along the western boundary of the appeal site, these fall within the boundary of the neighbour, and the extension has been positioned slightly in from

the boundary so as to minimise the impact on this planting. If it is felt necessary by the appeal inspector, the appellant would have no objection to a condition being imposed requiring details of the below ground works and foundation design of the extension are submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority to ensure the impact on the tree screen is minimised.

- 5.13 Taking into account the points that have been made in this section of the Grounds of Appeal, it is considered the proposed extension is not disproportionate to the existing dwelling and will not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the Copse Wood Estate ASLC.

Reason for Refusal 2

The proposed extension by reason of its size, siting, scale, depth and proximity to the shared boundary, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers at 20 The Broadwalk by causing a harmful sense of enclosure, reading as an overbearing rear addition and resulting in overdominance, particularly to principle areas amenity areas of the rear garden. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (January 2020).

- 5.14 The Council raise an objection to the impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property at No.20 The Broadwalk to the west of the appeal site. In relation to the impact on neighbour's, the letter sent from PJB Planning Ltd to the Council on 8th March 2023 provides a review of the impact on the neighbours on both sides of the appeal site. The following text is taken from this letter and the appeal inspector is requested to take these points into account in determining this appeal:

"There are two adjoining neighbours to No.18 The Broadwalk, No.16 and 20. In relation to this planning application, the extension is proposed to the western side of the property and will not have an adverse impact on the residents of No.16. This is taking into account the significant distance to the adjoining boundary between the properties.

One of the concerns that you have raised in your email is in relation to the positioning of the extension beside the shared boundary, which I assume you mean with No.20. Whilst I note your concern, this comment makes no mention of the actual distance between the existing ground floor habitable windows at No.20 and the proposed development. To the eastern side of No.20 there is a lean-to structure that is used for ancillary purposes and not habitable accommodation. This therefore means there is a significant gap of at least 4.7 m between the nearest neighbour's ground floor kitchen window and the proposed extension at No.18, and even greater distance to the neighbour's sunroom. A plan is attached showing the position of the existing kitchen window and sunroom at No.20 in relation to the proposed extension at No.18. It should also be taken into account that No.20's kitchen window is inset and its outlook to the side is interrupted by a pillar.

Planning permission has been recently granted at No.20 for a two storey side extension under LPA reference 14514/APP/2021/3550. The attached plan also shows the position and extent of the neighbour's approved extension at ground floor (outlined in green). At ground floor a large kitchen/dining and sitting area is proposed with large patio doors looking out onto the garden. Taking into account the position of the neighbours proposed sitting room window, this will mean the outlook from this room will be exactly the same whether the permitted development outbuilding at No.18 was constructed or the proposed extension in this application was constructed. Again the fall-back position of the permitted development scheme should be taken into account as a material consideration.

It should also be taken into account the proposed extension at No.18 is single storey and is low level flat roofed, which is the same as the outbuilding allowed under permitted development. It cannot therefore be said to be "overbearing" to this neighbour. Overbearing is created by height and vertical scale of a structure, this will not be the case as a result of this single storey proposal.

It should also be noted that the proposed extension projects northwards, and the neighbour at No.20 will continue to enjoy a large wide spacious garden, with a significant level of good quality amenity, unaffected by the proposed extension. Taking on board this assessment of the proposal, it clearly demonstrates that the proposed low level extension will not appear overbearing to the residents of No.20 and it will not result in an unacceptable loss of sunlight, daylight and privacy. I would therefore request that you reconsider your comment about the impact on the neighbour."

- 5.15 A copy of the letter from PJB Planning and attached plan that is referred to in the above text is included in **Appendix C**.
- 5.16 A copy of the planning permission ref 14514/APP/2021/3550 granted at No.20 The Broadwalk to extend the property to the side and approved plans are included in **Appendix E**.
- 5.17 Taking these points into account the appellant contends that extension will not appear "overbearing" or "overdominant" to the neighbour at No.20, and the proposed extension will not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity to the occupants of this adjoining property.

Comparable properties within Copse Wood Estate ASLC

- 5.18 The letter from PJB Planning Ltd sent on 8th March 2023 (see **Appendix C**) to the Council also provided details of comparable extensions that have been allowed and constructed to properties within the Copse Wood Estate ASLC, which the appeal inspector is requested to take into account in determining this appeal:

"Whilst each case should be considered on its own merits and I have highlighted in the previous sections of this letter matters that I believe should be taken into account in determining this application, it is notable around the surrounding residential area,

rear/side extensions that have been built close to the boundary of a neighbour and project rearwards.

What this does demonstrate is that due to the spacious wide nature of these surrounding properties, similar rear extensions have a been allowed and constructed within the same neighbourhood.

Comparable examples include:

21 Nicholas Way

Planning permission was granted for this development in February 2019 (LPA reference 22734/APP/2018/4116). In relation to the impact on neighbours, the officer commented in their report that whilst a 45 degree line would be breached from the neighbours rear facing windows, the single storey nature of the rear extension would have “an acceptable level of impact on the neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, loss of outlook, sense of dominance or loss of privacy.”

8 Linksway

This rear projection was part of an original planning permission in June 2017 (LPA reference 2645/APP/2016/4571) and a variation allowed in January 2021 (LPA reference 2645/APP/2020/3592). It was considered in these applications that the proposed development would “not result in additional overshadowing to the adjoining neighbours.”

18 Linksway

Whilst this property has an older side and rear extension, it shows how such a development can be sited beside a neighbouring property without having an unacceptable impact on their outlook and amenity.

In all these cases the development was not considered to have an unacceptable impact on the general character and appearance of the locality or street scene.

These examples demonstrate how single storey rear extension have been constructed within the locality and have not been deemed harmful to neighbours amenities or the character and appearance of the area.”

- 5.19 Copies of the planning permissions refer to in the above text and approved plans are included in **Appendix F**.

6.0 Suggested Planning Conditions

- 6.1 A list of suggested planning conditions are included appended to this appeal statement, should the Inspector be minded to grant planning permission (see **Appendix G**).

7.0 Conclusion

7.1 On behalf of the appellant, this Full Statement of Case has set out the consideration of the proposed development against the Council's decision to refuse planning permission in terms of the Adopted Local Plan, the London Plan 2021 and NPPF 2021, and other material considerations.

7.2 The appellant would therefore make the case that:

- The development proposed would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.
- It would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the locality.
- It would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the Copse Wood Estate ASLC.
- The development will also not appear overbearing or over dominant to the neighbouring property, No.20 The Broadwalk.

7.3 The appellant therefore respectfully requests that the inspector allow the appeal and grant planning permission.