



NORTON
TAYLOR
NUNN
LTD

Part two storey, part single storey rear extension and single storey front extension.

37B Cygnet Close, Northwood, HA6 2TA

Design, Access and Planning Statement

On behalf of Mr Shiv Popat

Prepared by Ben Norton LLB (Hons)

NOTICE

This document has been prepared for the stated purpose in accordance with the Agreement under which our services were commissioned and should not be used for any other purpose without the prior written consent of Norton Taylor Nunn Ltd. We accept no responsibility nor liability for the consequences of this document being used for a purpose other than that for which it was commissioned.



© Norton Taylor Nunn Ltd. All rights reserved. No part of this document may be otherwise reproduced or published in any form or by any means, including photocopying, storage on a computer or otherwise without the prior permission of the copyright holder.

Norton Taylor Nunn Ltd is a Company registered in England.
Company Registration Number 11595959
Registered Office: 11 Melton Meadow Road, Melton, IP12 1SB



Table of Contents

01 Introduction.....	4
02 Site and Surroundings	5
03 Planning History.....	6
04 Planning Policy.....	8
05 Policy Applied	9
06 Conclusions.....	11

01 Introduction

Norton Taylor Nunn Ltd has been retained to provide Town Planning advice in relation to the application for planning permission for part two storey, part single storey rear extension and single storey front extension at 37B Cygnet Close, Northwood, on behalf of Mr Shiv Popat.

A previous application¹ was refused by London Borough of Hillingdon Council and this application follows pre-application advice and extensive negotiations with the council's planning officers.

¹ 28173/APP/2018/4474 refused 1/3/19

02 Site and Surroundings

The application site is a two-storey detached dwelling to the west of Cygnet Close, a small cul-de-sac development in the very north of the Borough of Hillingdon, in the London suburb of Northwood.

Cygnet Close is characterised by large detached dwellings, with central front doors and large windows on a grid pattern. 37B is set back from the building line, unusually for dwellings to the west of Cygnet Close, but otherwise similar in style to neighbouring dwellings.

A single storey garage to the south side of the dwelling is set partly ahead of the street frontage, with the flat roof continuing across the frontage as far as the front door, where it is set upon two columns bracketing the front door.

A single storey rear extension extends across two thirds of the rear elevation, with a flat roof.

03 Planning History

Application Reference	Description	Received	Status
28173/APP/2018/4474	Part two storey, part single storey rear extension, single storey front extension and installation of basement level	21-12-18	Refused (P)
28173/APP/2016/910	Part two storey, part first floor side/rear extension, conversion of garage to habitable use, basement and landscaping alterations including a new terrace	03-03-16	Approval
28173/APP/2015/3664	Part two storey, part single storey rear extension with first floor terrace, first floor side extension and installation of habitable basement (Application for a Certificate of Lawful Development for a Proposed Development)	02-10-15	Refusal (P)
28173/APP/2013/3687	Single storey detached outbuilding to rear for use as storage and installation of timber wall (Retrospective)	11-12-13	Approved
28173/80/0198	Householder development - residential extension(P)	01-02-80	Approved

The latest application was refused for three reasons:

1. The proposed two storey rear extension, by reason of its excessive size, scale, height and roof design would represent a visually unsympathetic form of development that would fail to appear subordinate or harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the architectural composition and proportions of the original dwelling and have a harmful impact on the visual amenities of the wider area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

2. The proposed single storey front extension by reason of its size, scale and forward projection, represents an unduly intrusive and incongruous form of development, detrimental to the character, appearance and architectural composition of the existing property and the visual amenities of the street scene and the wider area. The proposal is thus contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (November 2012), Policies BE13, BE15 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - UDP Saved Policies (November 2012) and the adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.
3. The proposed two storey rear extension, by virtue of its size, scale, bulk, depth and proximity, would be detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers at No. 37a Cygnet Close, by reason of overdominance, visual intrusion and loss of outlook. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to policies BE19 and BE21 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved UDP Policies (November 2012) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions.

04 Planning Policy

The London Borough of Hillingdon Local Plan Part 2 – Development Management Policies, Appendix 1, states that:

“Good design of residential alterations and extensions will enhance the appearance of a house, and thus its value, as well as improving the appearance of the local area. It can also help improve people’s enjoyment of their house and reduce energy bills. Well-designed alterations and extensions, using quality materials, should be of a scale and form in keeping with the house and sympathetic to existing character, proportions, and floor plan. All proposed extensions should appear subordinate to the existing house, with appropriately selected windows, materials and detailing.”

It further provides that:

“The design of roof extensions should not create a dominant ‘top heavy’ appearance out of proportion with the rest of the building. It should be lower than the height of the main ridge and sit well above the eaves and away from the roof’s hips and valleys. As a guide, new roof extensions should not cover more than a third of the main roof.”

Policy DMHD 1: Alterations and Extension to Residential Dwellings, replaces the Hillingdon Design and Access Statement SPD on Residential Extensions. It provides detailed explanation of the constraints within which all planning applications must rest.

05 Proposals

The proposed development will see the existing garage incorporated into the house, with a wall and window replacing the garage door; a first floor side extension above the garage to provide greater space on the first floor. To the rear, a part single storey, part double storey extension will provide greater floor space, including a small rear screened terrace at first floor level. Above the extension, a hipped roof will minimise the dominance of the roof, with small flat roof extensions hidden behind faux slopes. A proposal for a basement was removed from the scheme following advice by officers.

06 Policy Applied

The proposed extensions meet the requirements of Policy DMHD1. The proposals ensure that there is no adverse cumulative impact of the proposal on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area. Indeed, the proposals will enhance the quality of the existing street.

A satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved, and the new extensions will appear subordinate to the main dwelling in floor area, width, depth and height.

The extensions respect the design of the original house and are of matching materials.

There is no loss of outlook from neighbouring properties and adequate garden space is retained. Adequate off-street parking is retained, despite the loss of the garage, and trees, hedges and other landscaping features will be retained.

The rear extension is 3.46m, which on a detached property should be no more than 4m in depth. The extension is therefore policy compliant in relation to rear extensions.

The extensions do not extend into an area provided by a 45-degree line of sight drawn from the centre of the nearest ground or first floor habitable room window of an adjacent property; no windows or openings overlook houses at a distance of less than 21 metres.

The pitched roofs on the extensions have been designed to a similar pitch and materials to the original roof. In order to maintain a subordinate look, two areas of flat roof have been disguised within the roof by false pitches, in a form that was acceptable to the LPA.

The side extension at first floor level is well within policy constraints. The side extension is 1.185m, substantially less than half the width of the original property. The extension is more than 1.5m from the side boundary, per Policy DMHD1 C(iv).

The alteration at the front of the house does not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate character of the street. It is the replacement of the garage door with a wall and window to facilitate the incorporation of the garage into the main dwelling.

While Policy E (iii) suggests that the raising of the main roof above the existing ridgeline of a house will generally not be supported. In this case, it is considered acceptable because the roof of this particular dwelling is abnormally shallow, and the increase in ridge height is considered appropriate.

07 Conclusions

Following changes to the design, to incorporate the comments of the LPA at Pre-Application Stage, the proposed development now meets the requirements of the LPA. The rear extension has been reduced in width, and the basement has been removed entirely.

The rear extension is narrower, and at first floor level provides a more sympathetic and symmetrical roof form, which was the primary objection of the LPA to previous iterations of the design.

The design development has been substantial and the proposal is now policy compliant, meaning little should stand between the proposals and the granting of permission, which the LPA is now urged to do.