

DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT (INCLUDING HERITAGE ASSESSMENT)

In respect of a planning application for the erection of pergola to rear garden (including 6no. solar panels to roof of pergola) and installation of 6no. solar panels to outbuilding roof at:

59 Monks Drive, Acton, London, W3 0ED



CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction			3
2.0	Site Context			
3.0	The Des	ign Approach		4
		Use	5	
		Layout	5	
		Scale	6	
		Appearance	6	
		Landscaping	6	
		Access	6	
4.0	Heritage	e Impacts		7
5.0	Conclusi	ions		10

1.0. Introduction

- 1.1. This Design and Access Statement has been prepared in support of an application for planning permission for the erection of a rear extension at 59 Monks Drive, London.
- 1.2 It is prepared in accordance with the Design Council document "Design and Access Statements: How to write, read and use them".
- 1.3 The statement should be read in conjunction with the drawings prepared by Franklyn Nevard Associates which accompany the planning application.
- 1.4 An assessment of the heritage impacts of the proposal is also set out within the relevant section of this statement.

2.0 Site Context

- 2.1 The existing property at 59 Monks Drive is an end of terrace property lying on the eastern side of the road. It is a two storey family house.
- 2.2 The application site is located within the Hanger Hill Garden Estate conservation area. The property is not a listed building, and there are no listed buildings in the immediate vicinity of the site. The images below show the front and rear of the property respectively.





2.3 The Hanger Hill Garden Estate Conservation Area Appraisal identifies the property as falling within Sub Area No.1 and recognises that:

"The largest sub area 1 is occupied by rows of housing in terraces of four or six with the occasional semidetached property located at end and corner sites. The 361 houses are located to the east side of the CA and extend from north to south. There are five main house types identified by the already published Design Guide by English Heritage on the estate and they are rather easy to recognise. However there are a few variations on these basic types".

2.4 The property is otherwise unconstrained and is located entirely in Flood Zone 1.

3.0 The Design Approach

- 3.1 Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's aims to achieve well-designed places.
- 3.2 It states (paragraph 131) that;
 - "131. The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Being clear about design expectations, and how these will be tested, is essential for achieving this".
- 3.3 The above has formed the basis of the design approach taken in respect of this proposal. The applicant, supported by Franklyn Nevard Associates, has given consideration to a number of material considerations in the design of this proposal with the overall aim of achieving a high standard of design that would complement the surroundings and ensure the development sits comfortably in its environs. Indeed, the applicant has recognised the need to provide a subservient addition to the property that does not compete with the scale and form of the main house and which reflects the character, scale and form of the adjacent properties also.

3.4 The following sets out how each of the various design matters have been addressed.

Use

- 3.5 The proposal seeks to make efficient use of land, in line with the aims of paragraph 124 of the NPPF which identifies that "Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions".
- 3.6 The proposed pergola would be sited in a contained position adjacent to the outbuilding and to the rear of the property. The existing dwelling is set within a residential area whereby the proposed pergola would bring no conflict with existing land uses. The pergola is a typical garden structure and would enable the continued use of the property as a dwellinghouse, providing improved accommodation for the needs of the applicant and their family. The provision of solar panels on its roof further emphasises the effective use of space, making renewable energy provision without giving rise to imposition on the streetscene of Monks Drive.

<u>Layout</u>

- 3.7 In developing the layout of the proposal, due consideration has been given to the surroundings and the amenity of existing residential properties.
- 3.8 The proposal would provide a modest structure set well within the boundaries of the site.

 Whilst solar panels to the roof of the garage will be visible in some immediate views to the rear of the property, these views are not prominent or important ones.
- 3.9 No changes are proposed to the frontage of the property and the existing parking provision would be unaltered also.
- 3.10 The design is simple and to be read as a garden structure set within a residential area.

3.11 For all of these reasons, the proposed layout is considered to have been developed following a detailed appraisal of the site and its surroundings, and thereby constitutes good design.

Amount

- 3.12 The proposal seeks a modest pergola measuring just 2.4m in height.
- 3.13 A total of 6no. PV panels are to be added to the roof of the pergola, and a further 6no. PV panels will be added to the roof of the outbuilding.

Landscaping

3.13 Given the nature of the proposal, there is limited opportunity for new soft landscaping to be incorporated in the scheme. However, the proposal does not remove any of the landscaped areas of the front or rear gardens.

Appearance

- 3.14 The pergola is designed to be a proportionate addition to the garden.
- 3.15 It has been designed to provide a covered walkway through this area of the garden, and is set close to the existing building. It does not affect the understanding of the house or it's character.
- 3.16 The proposal is, therefore, of an appearance that would respect the character of the local area.

Access

- 3.17 The proposal makes no changes to the pedestrian or vehicular access to the site.
- 3.18 While access to public transport may not be a major consideration when considering an application for a pergola, it is nevertheless noted that Monks Drive is in an accessible location.

It is close to a number of schools, shops and churches offers access to a range of facilities and services.

- 3.19 It is also within easy walking distance of a number of underground and overground rail stations. The area is also well located in terms of its accessibility to the primary road network, being located in close proximity to the A40.
- 3.20 The site is, therefore, in a wholly accessible location and the access elements of the proposed design have been fully addressed such as to enable safe and convenient access for all.

4.0 Heritage Impacts

- 4.1 The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a duty on local planning authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing conservation areas (Section 72).
- 4.2 Section 16 of the NPPF sets out the Government's position on the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. Paragraph 200 of the NPPF requires applicants to describe the impact of proposals on the significance of any heritage asset to a level of detail proportionate to the assets' importance. This should be no more than is sufficient to understand the potential of that impact on the significance. Paragraph 201 requires local planning authorities to identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
- 4.3 Paragraph 203 sets out that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
- 4.4 Paragraph 205 of the NPPF apportions great weight to a designated asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. The NPPF highlights that significance can be harmed or lost through physical change and any harm requires clear and convincing justification.
- 4.5 Paragraphs 207 and 208 address how local planning authorities should deal with situations where the assessment of impacts has identified harm to a heritage asset.
- 4.6 At the local level, Policy 7C of the local plan seeks to conserve and enhance the significance of the Borough's heritage assets.
- 4.7 These legislative and policy provisions thereby identify a need to assess the significance of the heritage asset in a proportionate manner, identify the impact of the proposed development on that significance, balance any harm arising against the public benefits and ensure that the special character of the area is preserved and, where possible, enhanced.
- 4.8 It is clear that the primary impacts to be taken into account here are the impact on the Conservation Area, as per the requirements of section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- 4.9 The impacts on significance here are visual ones. The Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) makes clear that:

"Hanger Hill Garden Estate CA forms a partial L shape, or a slightly curving corridor, the main residential roads of which are Princes Gardens, Tudor Gardens, Queens Drive, Monks Drive and Links Road. The form of the CA is determined by the constraints of the railway and underground tracks on either side and the layout maximises the corridor-like form.

The estate is an interesting example of a large-scale commercial development in a mock-Tudor style. The houses are relatively simple in design but with interesting details; it is as a 1920's group with neo-Tudor emphasis that the estate derives its importance.

The CA has a mainly residential use with some sports and leisure facilities and a place of worship called The Church of The Holy Family".

4.10 The CAA also makes clear that:

"The largest sub area 1 is occupied by rows of housing in terraces of four or six with the occasional semidetached property located at end and corner sites. The 361 houses are located to the east side of the CA and extend from north to south.

There are five main house types identified by the already published Design Guide by English Heritage on the estate and they are rather easy to recognise. However there are a few variations on these basic types".

- 4.11 The tests here, are, therefore, to what extent these proposals would have an impact on the Conservation Area through their visibility in public views and through their alteration to the rear aspect of the property relative to views from the access road to the rear and the adjacent properties.
- 4.12 The proposal seeks to provide a pergola set within the contained garden to the rear of the property. The pergola itself would be very limited in terms of views from outside the site, being largely contained to views from adjacent properties upper windows.
- 4.13 The solar panels on the garage roof would be visible from outside the site, but not from either the Monks Road or Princes Gardens streetscene. It would be seen only in the context of the rear aspect of these properties, where the houses dominate the views and the solar panels

can be accommodated against the backdrop of the outbuildings, walls, fences and landscaping that can be seen here.

- 4.14 The pergola and solar panels can thereby be accommodated without harm to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Therefore, whilst the solar panels may be visible in some views, such visibility is not harmful to the Conservation Area.
- 4.15 The proposal has been designed to comply with the Conservation Area design aspects of the Council's Residential Extensions SPD. The scale, design and proportion of the proposed works, coupled with the use of suitable and sensitive materials, enable the proposed works to sit comfortably in their surroundings such that they would not give rise to any tangible harm to the Conservation Area.

5.0 Conclusion

- 5.1 It is recognised that when providing structures such as this, and siting solar panels in a historic context, there is a need to ensure that the proposal would be delivered in a manner that constitutes good design and which would not give rise to harm to the Conservation Area.
- 5.2 The proposed pergola is well designed and would be in-keeping with the style and character of the house and the conservation area, consistent with the aims of the Council's planning policies and the wider aims of the NPPF as a whole.
- 5.3 The proposed development would make best use of the site without causing harm to the character of the house and the conservation area or harming the living conditions of neighbours. The solar panels would support the sustainability of the property, facilitating the use of renewable energy sources in a manner that does not intrude into elements that are important to the conservation area and where no harm occurs. It is not, therefore, necessary to balance the significant benefits of renewable energy provision against any heritage harm, as no such harm has been found to occur. The benefits are, therefore, able to be delivered with no negative effects.

planning permission for this modest development in the terms requested.

For all of these reasons, it is respectfully requested that the local planning authority grant

5.4