

 020 8969 0000

 WWW.STONESARCHITECTS.CO.UK

 MAIL@STONESARCHITECTS.CO.UK

 50 COLDHARBOUR LANE HAYES UB3 3EP

Design and Access Statement

Relating to

Single storey rear extension, a first floor rear extension infilling the area to the side of the existing first floor rear addition, a roof extension with two rear dormers to provide additional second floor living accommodation and a two storey front extension.

at

**41 Highfield Drive
Ickenham
UB10 8AW**

for

Mr Gurinder Madhan

3 September 2023

Project ref: 2023.006

Description of Existing House

Brief Design and Access Statement to support a re-submission Householder Application for a **single storey rear extension, first-floor rear extension infilling the area to the side of the existing first-floor rear addition, a roof extension with two rear dormers to provide additional second floor living accommodation and two-storey storey front extension** at the application site.

The application site comprises a detached two-storey dwelling located on the eastern side of Highfield Drive within a predominantly residential setting. The frontage is of site features hard and soft landscaping with provision for approximately 2-3 cars. The application site features an existing two-storey side and rear extension and single storey rear extension.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential and is varied in terms of form, proportion and appearance.

There are no heritage or policy constraints on the site.

Existing survey drawings and photo sheets are enclosed with the planning application.

Planning History

The application site has the following history:

Application Ref.	Description	Decision
30871/APP/2022/1516	Single storey rear extension, a first floor rear extension infilling the area to the side of the existing first floor rear addition, a roof extension with two rear dormers to provide additional second floor living accommodation and a two storey front extension.	Appealed/dismissed
30871/APP/2001/2555	Erection of two storey side and rear extension	Appealed/allowed
30871/APP/2001/376	Erection of single storey rear extension	Approved

Planning

The application is a re-submission of the previous Householder Application **30871/APP/2022/1516**, which was refused, reasons stated below. Having read the officers report the following Local Plan policies are considered applicable:

Part 1 Policies:

PT1.BE1 (2012) Built Environment

Part 2 Policies:

DMHB 11	(2021) Delivering good design
DMHB 18	(2021) Inclusive design
DMT 1	(2021) Housing quality and standards
LPP D4	NPPF12
LPP D5	DMHD 1
LPP D6	DMT 6
Design of New Development	NPPF 2021 - Achieving well-designed places
Private Outdoor Amenity Space	Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings
Managing Transport Impacts	Vehicle Parking

The new application scheme addresses the main issues in the Officer's Report.

Please see below comparative analysis table:

Ref	LBH Officers Report – 30871/APP/2022/1516	SA New Outline Scheme
1	<p><i>1. Single storey rear extensions to detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or more should not exceed 4.0 metres in depth.</i></p> <p><i>2. 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.</i></p> <p><i>3. In Conservation Areas and Areas of Special Local Character, flat roofed single storey extensions will be expected to be finished with a parapet.</i></p>	<p>1. The single storey rear extension has been retained as per the refused scheme in terms of the proposed extension, however the mono-pitch roof design has been replaced with a flat roof and a parapet wall enclosing the roof, which will be drained with hopper heads and rainwater pipes. The height of the extension is 3m from ground level, hence reducing the bulk and scale.</p> <p>2. The single rear extension is approximately in line with the approved scheme at 43 Highfield Drive (consent ref. 1248/APP/2022/3140), albeit there is a return adjacent to the boundary. It</p>

Ref	LBH Officers Report – 30871/APP/2022/1516	SA New Outline Scheme
	<p>4. <i>Two storey extensions should 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.</i></p>	<p>should be noted that the planning consent has been implemented and works have commenced on site.</p> <p>3. The two-storey rear extension has been reduced in depth and approximately in line with the adjoining properties nos. 39 and 43 Highfield Drive. Therefore the 45-degree lines of sight are not applicable.</p> <p>4. The depth of the extension is line with the existing first floor rear addition at the application site.</p> <p>5. Please note that the approved scheme at no.43 Highfield Drive has been shown on our outline proposal drawings.</p>
2	<p><i>It is noted that a number of dwellings along Highfield Drive have been extended, however the proposed design, form, and height of the proposed dwelling would appear excessively large within the context of the plot, relationship with neighbouring properties and the street scene. The proposed extensions would deteriorate any original architectural composition of the original dwelling and overwhelm the site.</i></p>	<p>1. The design on the whole has been reduced in bulk, size and scale so that its relationship with the neighbouring properties and the street scene harmonises with the general grain of the area.</p> <p>2. Please refer to the below for roof re-design.</p>
3	<p>1. <i>In line with the roof conversion, the application proposed to raise the eaves by 0.8m, raise ridge by 0.35m and includes the addition of two rear dormers. The proposed dormers would measure a 1.75m high and a length of 2.1m. The proposed roof conversion would result in a large crown</i></p>	<p>1. The roof extension of the new scheme has been re-designed as follows.</p> <p>2. The eaves height of the existing building has been retained.</p>

Ref	LBH Officers Report – 30871/APP/2022/1516	SA New Outline Scheme
	<p><i>roof with a skylight that may or may not be harmfully visible from mid-view points. The proposed roof form would appear disproportionate and top heavy on the subject dwelling, and visually incongruous with the other dwellings on the street. It is noted that crown roofs are present in the surrounding area, however not as large as that proposed and in combination with the extensions to the rear, front, and roof enlargement, would collectively fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and surrounding area.</i></p> <p><i>2. Questions are also raised as to the accuracy of the proposed street scene elevations given that the road is gently sloped resulting in the existing eaves and ridge heights of the neighbouring dwellings being different to that depicted on the submitted drawings. Consequently, the proposed roof extensions and raising of the eaves and ridge height would have an even greater harmful impact on the visual amenity of the street scene, particularly in being much taller than 43 Highfield Road and disproportionate when compared to No. 39 Highfield Drive.</i></p>	<p>3. The ridge height has been retained as per Policy DMHD 1 (<i>raising of a main roof above the existing ridgeline of a house will generally not be supported</i>)</p> <p>4. The proposed dormer windows have been re-designed so that they are in proportion with the new roof design and measure 1670mm wide, 1725mm deep and 1600mm high.</p> <p>5. With the reduced first floor footprint and the general reduction in scale and mass we have managed to reduce the crown roof from 32.7m² to 20.4m². The crown roof has been sensitively designed so that it is hidden from any views and will be at a lower height from the ridge.</p> <p>6. The revised design would harmonise better with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and in general with the character and appearance of the surrounding area.</p> <p>7. We have checked the proposed street scene and agree that the refused design was not an accurate representation of the street elevation. We have obtained levels of the road so as to accurately plot the gradient. The height of no.39 has been drawn using the existing topographical data and as Architects of no.41, we have accurately show the implemented scheme.</p>

Ref	LBH Officers Report – 30871/APP/2022/1516	SA New Outline Scheme
4	<p><i>Reason for refusal 1 - The proposed development by reason of its size, siting, scale, mass, bulk and design would result in an incongruous and overly dominant form of development which fails to respect the design of the original house, or read as subordinate to and relate to the established site context. The proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance to the host dwelling, streetscene and surrounding area.</i></p>	<p>The design has been reduced in mass, scale, bulk, size and siting. This is demonstrated on the new enclosed drawings.</p>

We have read through the Planning Inspectorate's Appeal Decision and provide the below comparative analysis with the new scheme:

	Appeal Decision APP/R5510/D/22/3306490	SA New outline scheme
A	<p>The appeal dwelling has been previously extended to the side and rear, and the Council indicates that the further rear extensions now proposed would project around 7m from the original rear building line at ground-floor level. Although it would significantly exceed the maximum depth for rear extensions specified within Policy DMHD 1 of the Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies 2020 ('the LPP2'), the resulting depth of the dwelling would not in itself be markedly out of keeping with other nearby buildings.</p>	<p>The rear single storey rear extension has been retained at the same depth as the previous application, as per the comment by the Planning Inspectorate</p>
B	<p>I observed crown roofs to many other dwellings nearby, but it appeared to me that most of the existing examples were typically of more modest dimensions, and the flat section to the appeal dwelling would certainly be one of the largest in the vicinity. While non-subordinate extensions and a change to the appearance of the dwelling would not necessarily be striking given the mixed street scene, I consider that the large upper bulk of the dwelling would give it a top-heavy appearance.</p>	<p>Refer to item 3 above.</p>

	Appeal Decision APP/R5510/D/22/3306490	SA New outline scheme
C	The increases in the height of the roof and eaves of the dwelling may be fairly modest, but it seems to me that they would further increase its apparent height above No 43, and would reduce if not eliminate the existing step down in height from 39 Highfield Drive.	Refer to item 3 above.
D	The bulk of the dwelling would therefore be appreciable, and while No 39 would provide some screening of the roof in views from the north, I cannot agree with the appellant that the crown roof would not be readily visible.	With the reduction of the crown roof, the sensitive detailing to conceal the flat section, retention of the existing ridge and eaves height, the bulk has been substantially reduced.
E	The Council's reason for refusal also refers to detriment to No 43 through loss of daylight/sunlight. However, this is not explained further within its evidence. Noting the orientation of No 43 to the south of the appeal dwelling, I am satisfied that the proposal would not cause unacceptable overshadowing or loss of sunlight. I also consider that the relationship would be unlikely to result in a significant loss of daylight so as to harm the quality of life of occupiers of this dwelling.	Please note the Planning Inspectorates comments.
F	Although I have found that it would not cause a harmful loss of light, I conclude that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of occupiers of 43 Highfield Drive in respect of outlook.	With the re-design we believe that the previous concerns have now been resolved.

Many houses in the borough have suffered from unseemly alterations, the street has a diverse style of detached houses creating a unique street scene.

We have undertaken a thorough Pre-Application Consultation with Richard Buxton, the Duty Planning Officer, by email which is shown in the Appendix at the end of this statement.

Brief

The applicants wish to extend their home to meet modern family needs, provide better planned living spaces, bedrooms, and bathrooms to accommodate their family.

The brief includes the assumption that any extension or any alterations should be in the same style and materials as the existing house and be non-controversial.

Design

The proposals are shown on drawings listed in the Appendix at the end of this statement.

The significant external changes proposed include the following:

- 1. Proposed single storey rear extension**
- 2. Proposed part double storey rear extension**
- 3. New second floor and roof extension with rear facing dormer window and rooflights**

Less significant external changes proposed include the following:

- 1. Introduction of an additional rooflights**
- 2. Retention and squaring off, of front elevation**
- 3. Introduction of photovoltaic panels on southern roof slope**
- 4. Dropped crown roof detail so that the roof appears like the ridge of a hipped roof**
- 5. A new staircase will be provided improve the circulation around the house**

Most materials will be to match existing work, the new bifold door assembly in the extension will be powder coated aluminium. Parapet walls to the ground floor extension with pre-cast concrete coping stones, flat mastic asphalt roof covering and solar reflective treatment.

No additional fenestration proposed as part of the application will affect any existing or approved residential or other buildings by way of overlooking or loss of privacy.

Access

The existing street access will be retained, with a new internal stair.

The new proposals will comply with the Building Regulations current at the time of commencement.

Existing refuse arrangements will continue.

There is ample storage available to store bicycles.

The application will not cause any increase in the number of cars to be parked on site and the existing car parking and turning facilities are adequate.

Appendix A

List of documents submitted with the application

Drawing no.	Drawing title
S01	Site Location Plan
	Existing Drawings by Midland Surveys: Topographical Survey, plans & Elevations
D01	Proposed Ground Floor
D02	Proposed First Floor
D03	Proposed Second Floor
D04	Proposed Roof Plan
D10	Existing & Proposed Section
D11	Proposed Elevation & Street
D20	Exploded Right Axo
D21	Exploded Left Rear Axo
D22	Axonometric Rear
D23	Axonometric Front
D30	Existing Photosheet
D31	Crown Roof Analysis
DAS	Design and access statement

Appendix B

Pre-Application correspondence (see over the page).

Subject: RE: SA-2023.006 - 41 Highfield Drive, Ickenham UB10 8AW

Date: Tuesday, 18 July 2023 at 10:00:15 British Summer Time

From: Richard Buxton

To: Jaspal Kaur

Attachments: image003.png, image006.png, image007.png, image008.jpg, image009.png

Jaspal,

I would suggest that it is worth a resubmission.

Please note that the comments made in this email represent officer opinion and cannot be seen to prejudice the Local Planning Authority's formal determination in relation to any application or planning matter.

Regards

Richard Buxton

BA (Hons) Dip TP

Planning Information Officer

Planning, Regeneration and Environment

Central Services

Hillingdon Council

Location, Civic Centre

London Borough of Hillingdon

01895 250230

rbuxton@hillingdon.gov.uk

From: Jaspal Kaur <jk@aa-plus.uk>

Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2023 5:45 PM

To: Richard Buxton <richardb@hillingdon.gov.uk>

Cc: Jatinder Chaggar <jc@stonesarchitects.co.uk>; jk@stonesarchitects.co.uk; Jatinder Chaggar <jc@aa-plus.uk>

Subject: Re: SA-2023.006 - 41 Highfield Drive, Ickenham UB10 8AW

Hi Richard,

Thanks for taking a look in the “too-hard” tray 😊

Jatinder is very jealous of your trip to Headingley, he's always wanted to go to The Ashes.....

FYI – number 43 application is essentially the same as the recent consent, with just a change in the external materials and a new porch.

Re the below, based on our revised design, would you say this scheme is acceptable and can be supported by planning?

Thanks again,

Jaspal

From: Richard Buxton <richardb@hillingdon.gov.uk>

Date: Thursday, 13 July 2023 at 10:36

To: Jaspal Kaur <jk@aa-plus.uk>

Subject: RE: SA-2023.006 - 41 Highfield Drive, Ickenham UB10 8AW

Hi Jaspal,

Apologies for the delay-going up to the Ashes at Headingley (Thursday/Friday) has taken it's toll!

Interesting that the Planning Inspector was concerned about impact on 43 + building heights when 43 have approval for a significant extension but he can only take on board what is on site:-

5. Nevertheless, the rear extensions would span the full width of the dwelling, and the proposal includes a crown roof with rear dormers and a large flat section

<https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate>

Appeal Decision APP/R5510/D/22/3306490

that would significantly increase the scale, mass and bulk of the upper part of the building. I observed crown roofs to many other dwellings nearby, but it appeared to me that most of the existing examples were typically of more modest dimensions, and the flat section to the appeal dwelling would certainly be one of the largest in the vicinity. While non-subordinate extensions and a change to the appearance of the dwelling would not necessarily be striking given the mixed street scene, I consider that the large upper bulk of the dwelling would give it a top-heavy appearance.

6. In addition, the proposal includes an increase in the height of the roof and eaves of the dwelling. Buildings on this part of Highfield Drive step generally down in height towards the south as land levels fall. The appellant suggests that the submitted plans show the relationship with neighbouring buildings accurately, but the outlines on the Proposed Elevations & Site Layout drawing show the eaves and roof of the existing appeal dwelling as lower than those of the neighbour at 43 Highfield Drive to the south. This is inconsistent with my observations at my visit where the eaves and roof of the appeal dwelling appeared to sit clearly above those of No 43, and as a result I am not persuaded that the illustrated relationships are representative.
7. The increases in the height of the roof and eaves of the dwelling may be fairly modest, but it seems to me that they would further increase its apparent height above No 43, and would reduce if not eliminate the existing step down in height from 39 Highfield Drive. This would disrupt the general pattern of development along this part of the street, and the height of the dwelling relative to its neighbours would draw further attention to the roof of the appeal dwelling causing it to appear conspicuous.
8. Furthermore, the relationship of the appeal dwelling with No 43 allows for simultaneous views of the ridges to the front and side of the building so that the presence and broad scale of the small existing crown roof is apparent. These views of the roof would be maintained if not increased given the greater height of the development above No 43. The bulk of the dwelling would therefore be appreciable, and while No 39 would provide some screening of the roof in views from the north, I cannot agree with the appellant that the crown roof would not be readily visible. In this respect, the proposal can be distinguished from permission granted on appeal for redevelopment of

The Inspector was a little sceptical of the accuracy of the street scene drawing so I am sure all efforts will be made to rectify that situation in the submission. The roof height has reduced and the crown element is smaller than the dismissed scheme so the direction of travel is positive.



Indeed, this is the latest submission for 43 though I haven't looked at the plans and it is yet to be determined, though it contains a crown roof analysis:-

1248/APP/2023/1941 Accepted	43 HIGHFIELD DRIVE ICKENHAM	Erection of a front porch, single storey rear extension, dou
Details	Addresses	Applicant
Events	EmailRequest	Agent
Dates Held Misc Consults Summary		
Recom	Site Hist	Plans
Policy	Conds	O.Rep
WFS		
Type	Householder	Amount Paid <u>206.00</u>
PP ref	PP-12282115 / PP-12282115	Officer Niamh McMenamin
Description	Erection of a front porch, single storey rear extension, double storey side extension, part double storey rear extension, conversion of roof space into a habitable room with rear facing dormer, roof lights, solar PV panels with alterations to materials of property.	

Let me know if I have overlooked anything specific that I should have picked up on.

Please note that the comments made in this email represent officer opinion and cannot be seen to prejudice the Local Planning Authority's formal determination in relation to any application or planning matter.

Regards

Richard Buxton
BA (Hons) Dip TP
Planning Information Officer
Planning
Place
Location, Civic Centre
London Borough of Hillingdon
01895 250230
rbuxton@hillingdon.gov.uk

From: Jaspal Kaur <jk@aa-plus.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, July 5, 2023 12:30 PM
To: Richard Buxton <richardb@hillingdon.gov.uk>
Cc: Richard Buxton <richardb@hillingdon.gov.uk>; Jatinder Chaggar <jc@stonesarchitects.co.uk>; jk@stonesarchitects.co.uk
Subject: FW: SA-2023.006 - 41 Highfield Drive, Ickenham UB10 8AW

Good Afternoon Richard,

Hope this email finds you well.

I have forwarded on the below and attached, as it was sent from Jatinder's new email address, and we have noticed that emails being sent to individuals for the first time from that address are making their way to junk folders. We weren't sure if you'd received this, hence have reverted to sending it from our '@aa-plus.uk' address. If you could kindly take a look and get back to us at your earliest convenience it would be appreciated.

Kind regards,

Jaspal Kaur
Practice Manager

t:01895 834961



Follow us on Instagram

Office closed on Fridays

From: jc@stonesarchitects.co.uk <jc@stonesarchitects.co.uk>
Date: Wednesday, 21 June 2023 at 21:39
To: Richard Buxton <rbuxton@hillingdon.gov.uk>
Cc: Richard Buxton <richardb@hillingdon.gov.uk>; Jaspal Kaur <jk@stonesarchitects.co.uk>
Subject: SA-2023.006 - 41 Highfield Drive, Ickenham UB10 8AW

Dear Richard,

I hope this email finds you well.

We act as Architects from Mr Madhan. Please could you provide Pre-Application advice for the new scheme, in connection with the above.

Application (Ref. 30871/APP/2022/1516) for a single-story rear extension, a first-floor rear extension infilling the area to the side of the existing first floor rear addition, a roof extension with two rear dormers to provide additional second floor living accommodation and a two-storey front extension with alterations was refused. The decision was then appealed, which was also dismissed (Ref. APP/R5510/D/22/3306490).

We have now been instructed to re-design the scheme considering the comments and reasons for refusal.

We enclose the following drawings for your comment:

1. Existing: Topographical and building survey by Midland Surveys, 39515
2. Outline Proposals: 2023.006/SK50, SK51, SK52, SK53, SK54 and SK55

I have outlined the issues raised in the officer's report and the Planning Inspectorate's report, and provided a summary of the revisions incorporated in the new outline design.

Ref	LBH Officers Report – 30871/APP/2022/1516	SA New Outline Scheme
1	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. <i>Single storey rear extensions to detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or more should not exceed 4.0 metres in depth.</i>2. <i>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.</i>3. <i>In Conservation Areas and Areas of Special Local Character, flat roofed single storey extensions will be expected to be finished with a parapet.</i>4. <i>Two storey extensions should 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.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The single storey rear extension has been retained as per the refused scheme in terms of the proposed extension, however the mono-pitch roof design has been replaced with a flat roof and a parapet wall enclosing the roof, which will be drained with hopper heads and rainwater pipes. The height of the extension is 3m from ground level, hence reducing the bulk and scale.2. The single rear extension is approximately line with the approved scheme at 43 Highfield Drive (consent ref. 1248/APP/2022/3140), albeit there is a return adjacent to the boundary. It should be noted that the planning consent has been implemented and works have commenced on site.3. The two-storey rear

		<p>extension has been reduced in depth and approximately line with the adjoining properties nos. 39 and 43 Highfield Drive. Therefore the 45-degree lines of sight are not applicable.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The depth of the extension is line with the existing first floor rear addition at the application site. 5. Please note that the approved scheme at no.43 Highfield Drive has been shown on our outline proposal drawings.
2	<p>It is noted that a number of dwellings along Highfield Drive have been extended, however the proposed design, form, and height of the proposed dwelling would appear excessively large within the context of the plot, relationship with neighbouring properties and the street scene. The proposed extensions would deteriorate any original architectural composition of the original dwelling and overwhelm the site.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The design on a whole has been reduced in bulk, size and scale so that its relationship with the neighbouring properties and the street scene harmonises with the general grain of the area. 2. Please refer to the below for roof re-design.
3	<p>3. <i>In line with the roof conversion, the application proposed to raise the eaves by 0.8m, raise ridge by 0.35m and includes the addition of two rear dormers. The proposed dormers would measure a 1.75m high and a length of</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The roof extension of the new scheme has been re-designed as follows. 6. The eaves height of the existing building has been retained. 7. The ridge height has been retained as per Policy DMHD 1 (<i>raising of a main roof above the existing</i>

	<p><i>2.1m. The proposed roof conversion would result in a large crown roof with a skylight that may or may not be harmfully visible from mid-view points. The proposed roof form would appear disproportionate and top heavy on the subject dwelling, and visually incongruous with the other dwellings on the street. It is noted that crown roofs are present in the surrounding area, however not as large as that proposed and in combination with the extensions to the rear, front, and roof enlargement, would collectively fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and surrounding area.</i></p> <p><i>4. Questions are also raised as to the accuracy of the proposed street scene elevations given that the road is gently sloped resulting in the existing eaves and ridge heights of the neighbouring dwellings being different to that depicted on the submitted drawings. Consequently, the proposed roof extensions and raising of the eaves and ridge height would have an even greater harmful impact on the visual amenity of the street scene, particularly in being much taller than 43 Highfield Road and disproportionate when compared to No. 39 Highfield Drive.</i></p>	<p><i>(the proposed roof conversion would result in a large crown roof with a skylight that may or may not be harmfully visible from mid-view points. The proposed roof form would appear disproportionate and top heavy on the subject dwelling, and visually incongruous with the other dwellings on the street. It is noted that crown roofs are present in the surrounding area, however not as large as that proposed and in combination with the extensions to the rear, front, and roof enlargement, would collectively fail to harmonise with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and would be detrimental to the character, appearance and visual amenities of the street scene and surrounding area.</i></p> <p><i>4. Questions are also raised as to the accuracy of the proposed street scene elevations given that the road is gently sloped resulting in the existing eaves and ridge heights of the neighbouring dwellings being different to that depicted on the submitted drawings. Consequently, the proposed roof extensions and raising of the eaves and ridge height would have an even greater harmful impact on the visual amenity of the street scene, particularly in being much taller than 43 Highfield Road and disproportionate when compared to No. 39 Highfield Drive.</i></p> <p><i>(the proposed dormer windows have been re-designed so that they in proportion with the new roof design and measure 1670mm wide, 1725mm deep and 1600mm high.</i></p> <p><i>9. With the reduced first floor footprint and the general reduction in scale and mass we have managed to reduce the crown roof from 32.7m² to 20.4m². The crown roof has been sensitively designed so that is hidden from any views and will be at lower height from the ridge.</i></p> <p><i>10. The revised design would harmonise better with the architectural composition of the original dwelling and in general with the character and appearance of the surrounding area.</i></p> <p><i>11. We have checked the proposed street scene and agree that the refused design was not an accurate representation of the street elevation. We will be obtaining levels of the road so that we can accurately plot the gradient. The height of no.39 has been drawn using the existing topographical data and as Architects of no.41, we are able to accurately show the implemented scheme.</i></p>
4	Reason for refusal 1 - The proposed development by reason of its size,	

<p><i>siting, scale, mass, bulk and design would result in an incongruous and overly dominant form of development which fails to respect the design of the original house, or read as subordinate to and relate to the established site context. The proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance to the host dwelling, streetscene and surrounding area.</i></p>	<p>1. The design has been reduced in mass, scale, bulk size, siting this is demonstrated on the new enclosed drawings.</p>
--	--

Ref	Appeal Decision APP/R5510/D/22/3306490	SA New outline scheme
A	<p>The appeal dwelling has been previously extended to the side and rear, and the Council indicates that the further rear extensions now proposed would project around 7m from the original rear building line at ground-floor level. Although it would significantly exceed the maximum depth for rear extensions specified within Policy DMHD 1 of the Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies 2020 ('the LPP2'), the resulting depth of the dwelling would not in itself be markedly out of keeping with other nearby buildings.</p>	<p>The rear single storey rear extension has been retained at the same depth as the previous application, as per the comment by the Planning Inspectorate</p>
B	<p>I observed crown roofs to many other dwellings nearby, but it appeared to me that most of the existing examples were typically of more modest dimensions, and the flat section to the appeal dwelling would certainly be one of the largest in the vicinity. While non-subordinate extensions and a change to the appearance of the dwelling would not necessarily be striking given the mixed street scene, I consider that the large</p>	<p>Refer to item 3 above.</p>

	upper bulk of the dwelling would give it a top-heavy appearance.	
C	The increases in the height of the roof and eaves of the dwelling may be fairly modest, but it seems to me that they would further increase its apparent height above No 43, and would reduce if not eliminate the existing step down in height from 39 Highfield Drive.	Refer to item 3 above.
D	The bulk of the dwelling would therefore be appreciable, and while No 39 would provide some screening of the roof in views from the north, I cannot agree with the appellant that the crown roof would not be readily visible.	With the reduction of the crown roof, the sensitive detailing to conceal the flat section, retention of the existing ridge and eaves height, the bulk has been substantially reduced.
E	The Council's reason for refusal also refers to detriment to No 43 through loss of daylight/sunlight. However, this is not explained further within its evidence. Noting the orientation of No 43 to the south of the appeal dwelling, I am satisfied that the proposal would not cause unacceptable overshadowing or loss of sunlight. I also consider that the relationship would be unlikely to result in a significant loss of daylight so as to harm the quality of life of occupiers of this dwelling.	Please note the Planning Inspectorates comments.
F	Although I have found that it would not cause a harmful loss of light, I conclude that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of occupiers of 43 Highfield Drive in respect of outlook.	With the re-design we believe that the previous concerns have now been resolved.

We and our clients are keen to work with the Local Planning Authority to obtain a favourable outcome.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards,

Jatinder Chaggar

Stones Architects Ltd

Hillingdon Council routinely monitors the content of emails sent and received via its network for the purposes of ensuring compliance with its policies and procedures. The contents of this message are for the attention and use of the intended addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient or addressee, or the person responsible for sending the message you may not copy, forward, disclose or otherwise use it or any part of it in any way. To do so may be unlawful. If you receive this email by mistake please advise the sender immediately. Where opinions are expressed they are not necessarily those of the London Borough of Hillingdon. Service by email is not accepted unless by prior agreement. Hillingdon Council routinely monitors the content of emails sent and received via its network for the purposes of ensuring compliance with its policies and procedures. The contents of this message are for the attention and use of the intended addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient or addressee, or the person responsible for sending the message you may not copy, forward, disclose or otherwise use it or any part of it in any way. To do so may be unlawful. If you receive this email by mistake please advise the sender immediately. Where opinions are expressed they are not necessarily those of the London Borough of Hillingdon. Service by email is not accepted unless by prior agreement.