

Planning Statement

7 Cordingley Road

Ruislip

HA4 7HH

Site location:

The site is located on Cordingley Rd with the eastern elevation facing the public highway and the southern elevation facing resident's car park. The site accommodates a two-storey residential property on a corner plot which forms the end of a block of terraced dwellings. All other dwellings have a front door which faces south towards the car park. The property benefits from a reasonable sized rear garden and off-street parking is provided within the car park.

Planning history:

55533/APP/2021/4391 - Two storey extension on the East elevation, relocation of the main entrance door from the East to the South elevation and a single storey rear extension. Refused

55533/APP/2020/3387 - Two storey front extension and single storey rear extension. Refused & Appeal Dismissed.

55533/APP/2020/2180 - Two storey front extension (fronting Cordingley Road), single storey rear extension and addition of car parking space and a electric vehicle charger.

Description of development

Single storey front and rear extension, moving of front door to elevation fronting the car park.

We are referring to the front extension as a front extension in the description above as per the opinion which the Hillingdon Officers have taken. In a normal scenario you would then consider the rear extension a side extension however the officers report for planning application reference 55533/APP/2021/4391 refers and assesses it as a rear extension so for consistency we have opted to retain this part of the description.

Comment on planning history

The site has been subject to quite a complex planning history. An initial application for a two-storey extension to the east elevation, the relocation of the main entrance door from the east to the south elevation was refused for two reasons

(1) The two storey extension would appear as an unduly prominent and inharmonious addition on the front elevation of the existing property, and would appear as an incongruous feature within the context of the street scene along Cordingley Road, with the introduction of cat slide roof form and a facade which lacks appropriate detail, particularly at ground floor level. It is considered that the extension would be harmful to the architectural composition of the existing property and the visual amenities of the street scene and surrounding area, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 - Strategic Policies (November 2012) and Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (January 2020).

(2) As presented, the parking element of the proposal fails to accord with the Council's 'Domestic Vehicle Footway Crossover' (DVFC) 2019 Policy guidance in that a crossover will only be approved where a standard car parking space (2.4m wide x 4.8m deep) at 90 degrees to the highway can be accommodated on the front garden/ forecourt of an application site. In addition, a vehicle must be able to leave the space at a right angle to the kerb. As such, the use of the proposed parking space would result in vehicular and pedestrian conflict on the adjoining public footway, prejudicial to

conditions of general highway and pedestrian safety, contrary to Policies DMT 2 and DMT 6 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 - Development Management Policies (January 2020).

The important reason for refusal is No1. Section 5.0 of the Case Officer report stated *"The two storey extension is to the front of the property but being on a corner plot, there is a 'return' building line along Cordingley Road which the extension does respect, being set back by approximately 3 metres from the front boundary. However, it is considered that on such a corner site, the extension would appear as an unduly prominent and inharmonious addition on the front elevation of the existing property and appear as an incongruous feature within the context of the street scene along Cordingley Road, with the introduction of cat slide roof form and a somewhat plain elevation, particularly at ground floor level with no fenestration. It is considered that the extension would be harmful to the composition of the existing property and the street scene and local area"*.

This is an important part of the decision as it has been carried forward into the assessment of all subsequent planning applications since this refusal.

Application ref 55533/APP/2020/3387 was submitted with amendments which included the removal of the catslide roof but retained the two storey front extension. This application was refused for the same reason as the previous application. The applicant appealed the Councils decision however the appeal inspector upheld the decision stating;

"However, it's two storey extent, including gable above, would appear dominant and bulky in a street where frontage extensions are more subservient in size and proportions. Its forward projection would roughly align with those along the street but they are of smaller and more subservient scale. Similarly, the dwellings opposite have similarly smaller scale forward projections. In contrast, the two storey extension would be overly dominant given its width and height. For all these reasons, the frontage extended dwelling would be unduly prominent and disharmonious failing to integrate into the surrounding area. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One - Strategic Policies (LP1) 2012 and Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (LP2) 2020."

Following the above decision Mrs Silver contact the Council's Planning Department to get advice on how the proposal could be amended to achieve a two storey front extension with a rear extension. She was advised by Richard Buxton to introduce a gable to the front extension, move the front door to the southern elevation facing the car park which would give the impression of a two storey side rather than two storey front extension. These changes were made and reflected in the most recent submission 55533/APP/2021/4391. Unfortunately N Taplin brought forward the inspectors view on the two storey element and deemed it to be a front extension (probably to ensure consistency in decision making) rather than R.Buxton's view which was that the two storey element could be considered a side extension given the location of the front doors along these group of terraced properties which are all within the southern elevation.

In addition, Mrs Silver has submitted a formal request for pre-application advice which was processed by Mr James Wells. In both the meeting and in the written response he explained the issues with a second-floor front extension, and we have now decided to move forward with a single storey front and rear extension.

The formal written response states that there are front extensions within the street scene therefore in principle one could be considered acceptable however any proposal which included a front extension would need to be justified if it presents a departure from policy.

“The Option 6 single storey front extension with a mono-pitch roof reduces the adverse impacts of the proposed two storey front extensions. Given the single storey frontage bays and projections with roofs above on properties in Cordingley Road and the local area, on balance it is considered that a single storey front extension with a pitched roof above would be more in keeping with the original house design. However, without a robust design justification for the proposed single storey front extension with regard to Policy DMHD 1 guidance that front extensions must be minor and not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street, a future application for a single storey front extension with a mono-pitched roof above may not be supported by the Council.”

Option 6 is what is being presented as part of this application and below are what we feel are reasonable points to justify why the extensions should be approved.

Planning assessment

The starting point for the assessment needs to be the planning history and in particular the inspector’s decision. It is disappointing to see the inspector took a “dim view” as alluded to by Council Officers on the proposed two storey element. In our opinion this could easily be considered a side extension which would give the applicant much greater scope for a two-storey extension.

The site is a corner plot comprises two storey end of terraced dwelling. The property has a different orientation to the rest of the dwelling which make up the terraced block as the front door faces Cordingley Road (east) whereas the rest of them face the car part to the south. The image below shows the location of the front doors.



There is a distinct land level change between the eastern elevation and Cordingley Road which rises up towards the east.



There is a large hedge which tunnels around the frontage and this obscures views of the ground floor completely and part of the first floor.



The inspector notes in the appeal decision that there have been front extensions constructed within the front elevations of other dwellings within Cordingley Rd. It is clear from looking at the street scape that the majority of properties along Cordingley Rd feature a ground floor outrigger to the front.



These are smaller in scale as noted by the inspector however given these points it should be generally accepted that some form of front extension should be acceptable.

Where 7 Cordingley differs significantly is the fact that it forms a group of terraces that front the south and not the east onto Cordingley Rd. We consider the moving of the front door to the southern elevation to mirror the established character within the terraced block and would therefore create the impression of a side and not front extension.

The proposal is to construct a single storey front and rear extension. The front extension would extend 3 metres in depth towards the front hedge which sits much higher than the ground floor and would effectively screen almost the entire extension. The rear extension would extend 3.3 metres in depth which would bring it out 0.45 m beyond the extension at the neighbouring property 5 Cordingley Road.

Policy

In terms of policy requirements. The Officers report and decision notice refers to the following policies:

Policy DMHB 11: Design of New Development

A) All development, including extensions, alterations and new buildings will be required to be designed to the highest standards and, incorporate principles of good design including:

i) harmonising with the local context by taking into account the surrounding:

- scale of development, considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures;
- building plot sizes and widths, plot coverage and established street patterns;
- building lines and setbacks, rooflines, streetscape rhythm, for example, gaps between structures and other streetscape elements, such as degree of enclosure;

- architectural composition and quality of detailing;

- local topography, views both from and to the site; and

- impact on neighbouring open spaces and their environment.

ii) ensuring the use of high quality building materials and finishes;

iii) ensuring that the internal design and layout of development maximises sustainability and is adaptable to different activities;

iv) protecting features of positive value within and adjacent to the site, including the safeguarding of heritage assets, designated and un-designated, and their settings; and

v) landscaping and tree planting to protect and enhance amenity, biodiversity and green infrastructure.

B) Development proposals should not adversely impact on the amenity, daylight and sunlight of adjacent properties and open space.

C) Development will be required to ensure that the design safeguards the satisfactory re-development of any adjoining sites which have development potential. In the case of proposals for major development sites, the Council will expect developers to prepare master plans and design codes and to agree these with the Council before developing detailed designs.

D) Development proposals should make sufficient provision for well designed internal and external storage space for general, recycling and organic waste, with suitable access for collection. External bins should be located and screened to avoid nuisance and adverse visual impacts to occupiers and neighbours.

Policy DMHD 1: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Dwellings

A) Planning applications relating to alterations and extensions of dwellings will be required to ensure that:

i) there is no adverse cumulative impact of the proposal on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area;

ii) a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved;

iii) new extensions appear subordinate to the main dwelling in their floor area, width, depth and height;

iv) new extensions respect the design of the original house and be of matching materials;

v) there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers;

vi) adequate garden space is retained;

vii) adequate off-street parking is retained, as set out in Table 1: Parking Standards in Appendix C;

viii) trees, hedges and other landscaping features are retained; and

ix) all extensions in Conservation Areas and Areas of Special Local Character, and to Listed and Locally Listed Buildings, are designed in keeping with the original house, in terms of layout, scale, proportions, roof form, window pattern, detailed design and materials.

B) Rear Extensions

- i) single storey rear extensions on terraced or semi-detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or less should not exceed 3.3 metres in depth or 3.6 metres where the plot width is 5 metres or more;
- ii) single storey rear extensions to detached houses with a plot width of 5 metres or more should not exceed 4.0 metres in depth;
- iii) 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;
- iv) in Conservation Areas and Areas of Special Local Character, flat roofed single storey extensions will be expected to be finished with a parapet;
- v) balconies or access to flat roofs which result in loss of privacy to nearby dwellings or gardens will not be permitted;
- vi) where hip to gable roof extensions exist, a two storey side extension will not be supported; and
- vii) in Conservation Areas, single storey side extensions may be required to be set back.

D) Front Extensions

- i) alterations and extensions to the front of a house must be minor and not alter the overall appearance of the house or dominate the character of the street. Front extensions extending across the entire frontage will be refused;
- ii) porches should be subordinate in scale and individually designed to respect the character and features of the original building; pastiche features will not be supported; and
- iii) notwithstanding the above, at least 25% of the front garden must be retained.

In reviewing the proposed options, we would implore the Council to consider the character of the area which includes front extensions, the land level change and boundary treatment which obscures most of the elevation and finally the pattern of existing development. The moving of the front door would mirror the existing pattern of development within this block of terraced properties and there for a two-storey extension would appear as a side extension and not a front extension.

Whilst we understand that weight will be afforded to the PINS decision on the previous application, this should not mean that the Council cannot apply their own judgement to the options provided. The Silver family have compromised heavily, and this is indicating the revised plans which no longer feature a first-floor front extension despite the Council Officers indication initially that one would be found acceptable.

The revised option meets the policy requirements of DMHB 11 as the extension would integrate with the character and appearance of the street scene. If the door is moved to the southern elevation this repeats the established character of the rest of the terraced block and in our opinion redressed the imbalance to this façade created by having the door on the eastern elevation. The front extension would be viewed as a side extension and meets the side extension criterion within DMHD 1. It would appear a subordinate addition, as would the rear extension and would not result in undue harm to any neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out in this statement we ask the Council Planning Officers to work with us to achieve much needed space within the clients first home. Officers have agreed that Mrs Silver has

been somewhat hard done by and we would appreciate an open line of communication to help resolve any concerns you may have and help us achieve our goal of creating much needed space for the Silver family.