



Juttla
Architects

Planning Statement

186-188 Balham High Road, London, SW12 9BP

Rev -

December 2016

Argyle House, Joel Street,
Northwood Hills, Middlesex, HA6 1NW
t 01923 840077 | f 01923 840078
juttla-architects.com | info@juttla-architects.com

RIBA 
Chartered Practice

1.The Application

- 1.1. Part two storey, part first floor side extension, single storey rear extension, conversion of double garage to habitable use, installation of canopy to front and raising of roof to allow conversion of roof space to habitable use to include 3 rear dormers, 1 front dormer and 2 new gable end windows to front (Part Retrospective)

2.Site Location

- 2.1. The application is for a site within the Copsewood Estate, on Linksway, Northwood. The plot is approximately 904m². Currently, the house is used for residential purposes for a single-family household. The properties on Linksway and the adjacent streets have a wide variety of form and materiality with traditional detailing and construction methods characterising the houses.
- 2.2. More recently many of the houses within the estate are being remodelled leading to an enrichment of the area. In order to function effectively for the modern family, there are improvements that need to be made to the current house, and the extension and remodel of the internal layout offers the most economical method.

3.Background

- 3.1. Previous applications exists for the site, the first being application 36910/APP/2013/107, whereby planning permission was sought for the demolition of the existing house and erection of a 5 bedroom house, however this scheme was since withdrawn and not decided.
- 3.2. A second application 36910/APP/2013/2338 was recommended for approval to the planning committee, however the officer recommendation was overturned by the members and the application was refused.
- 3.3. Subsequently, an appeal was lodged to the Planning Inspectorate, however this appeal was dismissed despite the application having satisfied every requirement of the planning department.
- 3.4. A third application 36910/APP/2014/2869 was submitted in order to address the two points for refusal and present a scheme that satisfied the Inspector's comments. This was approved at planning committee.
- 3.5. Following this approval for a new dwelling, an application was made for an extension to the dwelling, to a similar scale as the approved. This application 36910/APP/2014/3930 was approved.
- 3.6. Subsequent to this, a slight revised larger scheme 36910/APP/2015/621 was submitted and approved again under delegated powers. This scheme was pursued and built on site with slight amendments to suit building constraints.

- 3.7. It was advised by the planning department that a new application 36910/APP/2016/3323 be submitted in order to cover the amendments to the scheme that had occurred on site. This scheme was refused at planning committee for the below reasons:

3.7.1. *"The resultant scale and massing of the 'as built' extensions are considered to dominate the prominent corner setting to an unacceptable degree. The alterations would detract from, and fail to harmonise with, the character, form and modest scale of development within the surrounding street scene and Area of Special Local Character to the detriment of the building's appearance and setting. The scheme would thereby be contrary to Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan, policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies, BE5, BE13 and BE19 of the Hillingdon Local Plan - Saved policies and HDAS 'Residential Extensions'."*

3.7.2. *"The 'as built' alterations to the extension by reason of the proximity, siting, size of the windows and alteration to the internal layouts of the extension, are considered to overlook the private garden of No. 3 Copse Wood Way to an unacceptable degree, to the detriment of these occupiers. The application would thereby erode the privacy and living conditions of these occupants to an unacceptable degree. Further, the increase in the height of the extensions would result in a scheme that would appear unduly dominant and visually overbearing to the detriment of the amenities of No. 3 Copse Wood Way. The application therefore fails to comply with the NPPF, Policies BE21 and BE24 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Saved Policies and HDAS 'Residential Extensions'."*

- 3.8. An application is now again submitted to seek approval for the as built property, which has undergone a slight amendment. It also seeks to confirm the as built size of the property, which was incorrectly stated in the previous application.

4. Amendments to Approved Scheme

- 4.1. During the construction of the roof, it was necessary to alter the pitch in order to allow the two elements of the existing dwelling and existing garage to be adequately joined. This required the ridge height to be increased by approximately 400mm to a total of 9M. The approved dwelling was approximately 8.6M.
- 4.2. However, it is felt that as there was a previously approved new build scheme 36910/APP/2014/2869, which was 9.1M tall, there would be no additional mass or bulk that was not previously allowed by the council. Approval exists for a larger house on the site, and as such, the as built property is not overly large, as the previous refusal suggests. Thus, it is thought that the first reason for refusal has been mitigated.
- 4.3. Regarding the second reason for refusal, it is accepted that the internal layout has changed from the approved, however it should be noted that the previous approved scheme have windows into habitable rooms in the same locations. As such there is no additional overlooking into the adjacent property to that which was previously approved.
- 4.4. Nevertheless, in order to mitigate the reason for refusal undeniably, two of the rear dormer windows have been amended and are now to be obscured glazed. This removes any views that may have been afforded into the garden of adjacent property.

5. Conclusions

- 5.1. Further to above clarifications, it should be noted that a meeting was held between the applicant, the applicant's representative and the planning team leader Neil McClellan. This meeting was held on 20th December at the council offices shortly after the refusal of the latest application.
- 5.2. At this meeting, the two points for refusal were discussed and it was agreed that the first refusal reason under scale and massing was in fact incorrect. Due to the previous larger approved scheme existing, this smaller scheme was acceptable, and does in fact blend in with the streetscene and ridge heights prevalent in the surrounding area.
- 5.3. In order to mitigate the second reason for refusal, it was agreed that two of the dormers to the rear would be made obscured glazed to remove the views into the garden of the adjacent property.
- 5.4. As a result of the above amendments and clarifications, the refusal reason have been adequately mitigated. Thus, it is felt that the proposal at 2 Linksway is of an acceptable standard and we look to working with the planners on this scheme to facilitate a favourable decision.

6. As Built Site Photographs

