

## **PLANNING STATEMENT**

### **Friars Pardon, Tile Kiln Lane, Harefield UB9 6LU**



Existing Entrance Elevation

#### **1. INTRODUCTION**

This Planning Application is a re-submission following a recent refusal that addresses the previous reasons for refusal. The design has remained the same, following the instruction of specialist planning advice.



Reference - Google Maps Aerial

## Proposal

Erection of a single storey side extension, a single storey rear extension and the erection of a front canopy extending the full width of the front elevation following demolition of existing garage.

## Site Location (as described in the delegated report)

The application site is located on the west side of Tile Kiln Lane, Ruislip, approximately 200m east of its junction with Breakspear Road South, and is occupied by a detached, two-

---

storey dwelling with a projecting two-storey gable and a detached garage. The dwelling is constructed in red brick with a tiled roof, a white rendered first floor and a mock Tudor finish. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character. 'Boundary Oak' is a detached property located to the east of the site. 'The Willows' is a detached property to the north of the site.

The site is located in the Green Belt. The southern part of the site is within the Functional Flood Plain and Flood Zone 3. The central and north-western part of the site is within Flood Zone 2. The north-eastern part of the site, where the dwelling and garage are sited, is within Flood Zone 1. The site is not designated within a Conservation Area or an Area of Special Local Character. The site does not contain any Listed Buildings.

### **Green Belt (Reason for refusal 2)**

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) attaches great importance to the Green Belt. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.

Paragraph 152 of the NPPF (2023) states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

Paragraph 153 of the NPPF (2023) states that when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Paragraph 154 of the NPPF (2023) states that local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

---

- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces; this is supported by Policy G2 of the London Plan (2021).

In terms of local policy, the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 (2012) gives strong protection to Green Belt land. Policy EM2 states that the Council will seek to maintain the current extent of the Green Belt and any proposals for development in the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land will be assessed against national and London Plan policies, including the very special circumstances test.

Policy DME1 4 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) also states that:

- A) Inappropriate development in the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land will not be permitted unless there are very special circumstances.
- B) Extensions and redevelopment on sites in the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land will be permitted only where the proposal would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land, and the purposes of including land within it, than the existing development, having regard to:
  - i) the height and bulk of the existing building on the site;
  - ii) the proportion of the site that is already developed;
  - iii) the footprint, distribution and character of the existing buildings on the site;
  - iv) the relationship of the proposal with any development on the site that is to be retained; and
  - v) the visual amenity and character of the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land.

Specifically, paragraph 6.20 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 (2020) states that dwellings are inappropriate development in the Green Belt and Metropolitan Open Land but where they exist, alterations and extensions will be acceptable, provided they do not result in

---

disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

The above policies are referenced in the delegated report with Officers referring to the extension as substantial. There is also a reference to the floor space being over the existing ground floor area and this appears to result in the reason for refusal 2 (Harm to the openness of the Green Belt).

Before responding to the reason for refusal, due regard should be given to paragraph 154 in its entirety as it does appear that exception c) and d) could apply to this development. In addition, due regard should be given to the overarching aims of the Green Belt policies and that is to protect the openness of the land which is used to segregate settlements by preventing urban sprawl.

The initial part of the policy test for this development is the type of development proposed. This is a residential property and the extensions proposed would serve as ancillary space to the functioning of the main dwellinghouse therefore there is no intensification of use proposed.

Importantly, consideration should be given to the contribution and impact the existing outbuilding which is to be demolished makes to the openness of the Green Belt. The building is single storey, detached and is constructed of similar materials to match the existing dwelling. However, we would contend that it does not positively contribute to the character and appearance of the property, or its Green Belt setting given its deteriorating state. Therefore, removing the structure would be beneficial to both the character and appearance of the property and the Green Belt

The next section of note is whether the development is appropriate or inappropriate development in accordance with the NPPF descriptions. Exception C of paragraph 154 is referenced in the report so this will be explored first.

Regarding point c), accompanying this statement is a revised set of drawings. Drawing 2413-101 now includes a total measurement for the existing building and including the

---

proposed extension. As shown the existing GIA of 99m<sup>2</sup> (ground floor) and the existing footprint is 117m<sup>2</sup>. When combined with the total extensions this would amount to a GIA of 187m<sup>2</sup>. The proposal would not result in an increase in GIA of more than 100%. A modest single storey rear extension is proposed along with the demolition of the existing detached workshop and construction of a side extension to form a new workshop. The new workshop would be larger in scale, but it has been proposed as single storey to reduce any impact upon the openness of the Green Belt. Removing the old workshop building and relocating this to within the proposed side extension would redress the sprawling nature of the buildings on site at present.

In terms of the rear extension (orangery) this is extremely modest in scale and is set behind the two-storey gable end of the existing property therefore would not be visible from most views from within the site frontage or from outside of the site. A vast amount of land is to be retained around the building as soft landscaping which would again lend itself to its Green Belt designation and provide a green setting to the built form on site.

We would like to bring Part D of paragraph 154 to Officers attention also. The proposal does involve the demolition of the existing workshop which is a building as referred to in the policy and this would be replaced (also referred to in the policy) within the proposed side extension. Therefore, we consider this exception relevant to the consideration of the application. Having regard for the measurements above it cannot be agreed that the development proposed is materially larger than the building which currently existing when seen as a whole. The GIA demonstrates that there is not a significant increase. The measurement which are more commonly used to assess a developments impact upon the openness of the Green Belt is m<sup>3</sup> and given that the building is two stories in height, the existing outbuilding would be demolished and the proposal is for two ancillary extensions to the existing house the cubic metre content would not be substantially increased and therefore would not result in a building which is materially larger than proposed.

---

To conclude the Green Belt assessment the extensions to the building are subordinate in scale particularly when viewed individually but also cumulatively. They have been restricted to single storey and the removal of the existing outbuilding would redress the sprawling nature of the built form on site now. We consider that the development is not a departure from the Green Belt policy and is appropriate development by conforming with both exceptions c) and d) of paragraph 154 of the NPPF.

### **Character and Appearance (Reason for refusal 1)**

Officers have referred to the guidance measurements within the Local Plan Policies and this is understandable. However, it is very common to depart from these prescriptive measurements particularly where properties are sited within spacious plots and are surrounded by land such as Green Belt open land and other properties which have been subject to similar levels of development.

Having read the delegated report it does not appear to us that due regard has been given to what should be the overarching principle of a design policy and this should be to prevent the impacts of overdevelopment both in terms of a reduction in light or outlook for neighbours and also of upon the character and uniformity of the existing pattern of development.

We have included the site location description within this statement as it does provide a good description of the actual site but does not provide any reasonable context to the local context and the development which has been approved on adjacent sites. We will do this here. Immediately adjacent to the east of the site is open Green Belt land. To the west is Boundary Oak which is similar in terms of design to Friars Pardon but features a two storey triple fronted garage linked by a small single storey structure built onto the end of the property. There is a rear extension that has been constructed to the rear of the two-storey garage and to the rear of the single storey structure which links the main house with the garage. We have not been

---

able to identify any history of extensions, but a site visit does clearly evidence that the property has been extended to a similar scale that is proposed for this application.

The Paddock is further to the west beyond Boundary Oak which has been substantially altered since it was originally built. A site visit indicates that there have been various extensions to both the side and rear and a swimming pool constructed in the garden.

Finally, beyond The Paddock is Lantern House. This property has also been substantially altered through the construction of a single storey detached garage and store and the erection of a garden room to the rear and side. This property also features a considerable amount of hardstanding to the front and side which Friars Pardon does not and does not propose to construct.

The above context is relevant because it establishes the principle of larger extensions to these properties. All of the properties mentioned above are set within very spacious plots and often behind boundary treatments consisting of low-level walls and gate or planting. The cul-de-sac, which Friars Pardon is located at the end of, features several extensions which are visible from the street. Although the side extension where the existing workshop would be relocated to would exceed the guidance measurement in the Local Plan, it would still appear subordinate to the existing house and would not compromise its architectural integrity. The roof over the extension has been designed to be in keeping with the existing house and is vastly set down from the main roof ridge so it would be read as a subordinate extension. A large separation distance would be created between the property and the neighbour boundary which would again help retain the spacious nature and character of this property and the wider context.

In terms of the single storey rear extension, like the side extension this does exceed the guidance measurements, but it needs to be viewed in context with the spacious nature of the plot and the scale of the existing property. It is modest in terms of the depth and width when compared to the main house and would be single storey with materials chosen to

---

integrate with the design of the existing building. It is a subordinate addition to the property which is what the policies in the report seek to achieve.

Regarding the front canopy this is a lightweight structure and would be barely visible from the street. A modest part of the side of the roof would be visible so we would not agree that this is not subordinate or would impact the street scape in any way.

## Conclusion

We appreciate the time and effort dedicated to what was a comprehensive report written by Officers and this statement is formed to draw attention to the other factors which should be considered when determining the application. We consider the development accords with the aims of the Green Belt policies and local design policies for the reasons set out above.

Finally, we would encourage the planning authority to engage with us on any concerns they may have. We were disappointed with the lack of engagement previously and the refusal of the application on matters which could have been discussed quite quickly and ultimately resolved.

*END OF DOCUMENT*