

# **DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT**

**19 Church Avenue, Ruislip, HA4 7HUZ**

Prepared By  
**The Gillett Macleod Partnership**  
17<sup>th</sup> September 2024

## **CONTEXT**

The application is for a two storey side and single storey rear extension to provide additional living space for the dwelling house. The application site is within the Ruislip village conservation area and careful consideration has been given to the proposal in light of this.

There was a previous application made by a different agent recently, reference: 11016/APP/2022/849. The application was refused planning permission. A precis of the reasons for refusal are:

1. Independent access resulting in the creation of a self-contained residential unit;
2. The scale of the proposed extension and the cumulative effects of the extensions with the combined rear dormers;
3. The lack of private amenity space for the self-contained residential unit.

## **DESIGN**

The proposed design seeks to address these concerns as follows:

1. The proposal has been designed as a conventional extension to the premises with no independent access and rooms off of the common staircase which will clearly be used in conjunction with the existing dwelling house and not as a separate annex;

2. The scale of the proposed extensions has been carefully considered in the context of the surrounding buildings in Church Road and a gap of 4.25m has been left between the two storey side extension and the southern boundary. We have also provided a street scene which clearly illustrates that our proposal provides a bigger gap to the southern boundary than the adjacent houses in Church Road. We have also omitted the rear dormer which reduces the cumulative effect mentioned in reason No 2.
3. The proposal does not include for a self-contained residential unit and so the issue of amenity space is not relevant.

Having addressed the reasons for refusal, careful consideration has been given to the architectural style of the proposed extension which has been set back from the front boundary and set down from the ridge in line with your standards to make the proposed extension subordinate to the main house. The gap to the southern boundary far exceeds your 1m standard being 4.25m and is much greater than the houses at No. 17 – 1.7m; No. 23 – 2m; No.'s 25 and 27 – 1.1m.

I trust having answered the previous reasons for refusal that favourable consideration can be given to our application.

## **ACCESS**

There are no access issues associated with our proposal.

**Mr Jeffrey Gillett, R.I.B.A.**