

SUPPORTING STATEMENT
FOR
A PLANNING APPLICATION
FOR
ERECTION OF PART SINGLE STOREY, PART DOUBLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION,
FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION AND CHANGES TO FENESTRATION
INCLUDING DORMERS TO SIDE AND REAR

AT:
69 WARREN ROAD ICKENHAM UB10 8AD

FEBRUARY 2024

Prepared by:



1. Introduction

- 1.1. This statement is submitted on behalf of the Applicant, Mr Nathan Bunce, in respect of an application for planning permission for extensions and alterations at 69 Warren Road, Ickenham.
- 1.2. It follows two previous applications as follows:
- 1.3. Application ref. No. 13661/APP/2022/1953 for part demolition and erection of part two storey, part single storey rear extension, two storey side extension and erection of dormer extension to rear and side; alterations to existing ground and first floor fenestration including new windows and door; this was refused on the 17th August 2022.
- 1.4. Application ref: ref. No. 13661/APP/2023/326 for erection of part two storey, part single storey rear extension, first floor side extension and changes to fenestration, which was refused on the 30th March 2023.
- 1.5. The latter application was the subject of an appeal which was dismissed on the 8th November 2023 (Appendix 1). The Inspector found that the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area as well as on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property, no. 71 Warren Road.
- 1.6. This further amended application seeks to address the concerns of the Inspector – these will be considered in detail below.

2. The Application

- 2.1. The following plans comprise the revised application:
 - 2022/1163/1 (existing ground floor plan)
 - 2022/1163/2 (existing first floor plan)
 - 2022/1163/3 (site plan)
 - 2022/1163/5G (proposed ground floor plan)
 - 2022/1163 /6E (proposed first floor plan)
 - 2022/1163/7E (proposed second floor plan)
 - 2022/1163/8J (proposed elevations)
 - 2022/1163/10 (location plan 1:1250)
 - 2022/1163/11B (site plan with 45 degree angles)
- 2.2. The application is similar in terms of its description to the last application, though does now include two dormers. However, the main elements of the proposed extension has been altered in a number of important ways as follows:
 - The depth (rearward projection) of the rear first floor element has been reduced to 4 metres
 - The height of the two-storey element of the rear extension has been reduced so that it is now below that of the original ridge height of the host dwelling with lower eaves level on the eastern elevation (facing no. 71), also below that of the host dwelling;
 - the eastern elevation has also been set back from the flank elevation of the first floor side addition (which reflects the position of the existing single-storey side element)
 - The depth of the single-storey rear addition has also been reduced, extending only a further 2 metres beyond the two-storey element
- 2.3. The effect of these changes is discussed below.

3. Policy Context

Local Policy and Guidance

- 3.1. The Development Plan comprises the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One Strategic Policies (2012) (HLP1), the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two Development Management Policies (2020) (HLP2) and The London Plan (2021) (LP).
- 3.2. As previously referred to by the Council, the following policies are considered to be the most relevant:
- 3.3. Policy BE1 of HLP1.
- 3.4. Policies DMHD1, DMHB11 and DMHB12 of the HLP2
- 3.5. Policies D1, D3 and D4 of the LP.
- 3.6. The Council did not refer to any other local or supplementary planning documents and none are considered to be relevant.

National Policy and Guidance

- 3.7. National policy is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework, 2023 (NPPF). As well as the sustainable development objectives set out in section 2, 12 (Achieving well designed places) is particularly relevant. Although the NPPF has been recently updated, these policies remain similar to those previously in place.

4. Description of the appeal site and its surroundings

- 4.1. The appeal site lies on the northern side of Warren Road within a residential area towards the southern edge of Ickenham. The road is characterised by a wide grass verge with mature trees, giving a pleasant tree-lined appearance to the street scene. The built form comprises of large, detached dwellings set back from the road frontage behind parking / garden areas, many of which are enclosed by soft landscaping and hedging. The dwellings are predominantly of traditional design and appearance with hipped tiled roofs and brick elevations incorporating bay windows which provides a generally continuous built frontage with only small gaps between dwellings. They are set within generous plots with long rear back gardens.
- 4.2. Number 69 is a large detached two storey dwelling with hipped roof and single storey side addition with catslide roof and is of traditional appearance. It is set back from the road frontage behind a mainly lawned front garden with boundary hedging and mature tree.
- 4.3. A number of nearby properties have been successfully extended notably including nos. 61, 63 and 65 on the same side of Warren Road and nos. 46 and 50 on the opposite side of the road. These have extended the dwellings both to the side and rear with new larger hipped roofs over, some including central flat 'crown' roof sections.
- 4.4. Particular attention is drawn to no. 61 and the scheme allowed on appeal.

5. Response to the Inspector's concerns

5.1. The Inspector considered two main issues and found concerns in respect of both. These can be summarised as follows:

- In terms of the effect on character and appearance, he concluded that there would be a harmful impact, due to the overall depth, size and scale of the appeal proposal.
- In respect of the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining properties, he concluded that there would be a harmful impact on the occupiers of No. 71 due to loss of light and an overbearing impact on the first-floor window facing the application site. It is of note that he found no adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 67.

5.2. The above issues are addressed separately below:

Character and Appearance

5.3. The changes outlined above have considerably reduced the overall size, scale and bulk of the additions. In particular, the rear additions are significantly reduced such that they appear appropriately subservient to the original dwelling. In the context of the comments made in paragraph 5 of the appeal decision, this would result in a much reduced impact, in particular in terms of additional bulk and depth of the flank elevation.

5.4. It is also of note that the first-floor rear element is now of similar depth as that permitted at No. 61, which was a dwelling of similar size and proportions originally as this property, at no. 69. However, unlike the extension at No. 61, the rear roof area would be of lower ridge height. Whilst the proposal now includes a rear and side dormer, these are relatively small additions in terms of volume and positioned in a way that they sit comfortably and proportionately within the roofslopes. The slightly greater depth of the single storey element, compared to that permitted at No. 61, adds little in terms of visible bulk.

5.5. In respect of the first-floor side extension, the Inspector noted that it would appear subservient, though also suggested that glimpses of the 'deep, largely unrelieved' flank elevations would be obtained. The eastern flank elevation could no longer be described in this way as only the flank elevation of the first-floor addition would be 'glimpsed', the rear element being largely 'hidden' due to it being set in from this side element. The western elevation would also appear noticeably less deep due to the reduction in depth. In addition, this elevation would retain the chimney breasts and windows thus providing some relief.

5.6. The extensions permitted at No. 61 have been previously referred to. The Council's delegated officer report in respect of the previous application, specifically refers to No. 61 at the top of page 6 noting that the resulting depth of the dwelling is 13 metres. This can now be compared with an overall depth of 14m proposed in respect of the ground floor area, with the first-floor depth being the same. It cannot reasonably now be concluded that the overall scale of the additions would be unacceptable given these comparisons, particularly in terms of street scene views where the single storey depth would be hardly perceptible.

5.7. In these circumstances, similar conclusions can be reached as did the Inspector in allowing the appeal at No. 61 for that scheme (Appendix 2). The Inspector in that appeal noted (see paragraph 5) "*visibility of the side elevations, as with the crown roof, would be very limited so that these aspects and the additional depth created would have little impact on the character and appearance of the building and less on the*

overall street scene.” The gaps between the adjoining dwellings are not dissimilar and it is considered that the same conclusions can now reasonably be reached in respect of this revised scheme for No. 69.

- 5.8. The concerns of the Inspector in the previous appeal decision for this site will therefore be addressed by the proposed revisions and the overall reduction in the bulk and height of the proposal will ensure that, cumulatively, they will appear as subservient and proportionate additions. Furthermore, they will ensure that they are in keeping with the scale and form of adjacent dwellings, the original forms of which have also been extended to a significant degree. It is of note that the Inspector did not find the crown roof to be out of keeping with this part of Warren Road.
- 5.9. The revised scheme will therefore comply with Policies DMHB11 and DMHB12, and supporting paragraphs, which state that development should harmonise with the host dwelling and the local context taking account of its surroundings and townscape character and which recognise the role that extensions to dwellings can play in enhancing the appearance of the house and the local area, as well as improving the enjoyment of the house for its occupiers and reducing energy bills.
- 5.10. It will also satisfy Policy DMHD1 which seeks to ensure that there is no adverse cumulative impact, that new extensions appear subordinate to the main dwelling, that the design of the original house is respected. LP policies would also be satisfied.
- 5.11. Overall, it is not unreasonable to conclude that the revised scheme will ensure that the dwelling will sit comfortably within the street scene and in the context of neighbouring properties such as to be in harmony with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Living Conditions

- 5.12. In this regard, the Inspector in dealing with this issue (paragraphs 11-15 of the decision letter) only found harm in relation to the impact on the first-floor side facing window of the adjoining property at No. 71 (paragraph 15 refers). This is somewhat confusing given that the Inspector appeared to have concluded in paragraph 12 that there would not be any ‘significant effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 71 with regard to light and outlook.’ Notwithstanding this, the effect of the revised scheme on this window is assessed below.
- 5.13. The window in question, previously thought to be a bedroom window, has been confirmed as such by the Applicant in discussions with this neighbour. However, it is of relevance that it was inserted in the flank elevation following the construction of the two-storey rear extension – It has not been possible to find the reference number for this application on the Council’s website, but a later 2020 permission provides a floor plan of the first floor. This shows that the rear facing room that was added, a bathroom, is only accessible via this bedroom, providing a large en-suite. The connecting double doors are glass to allow light through to the ‘inner’ bedroom from the large rear facing window that was provided. Therefore, the flank window is not the only source of light for this bedroom.
- 5.14. In addition, it is noted that this window already faces directly towards the two-storey flank elevation of the existing dwelling at No. 69 with its orientation being to the west. This means that the existing house already significantly limits the sunlight enjoyed by this window. The daylight received by the window is also affected by this relationship, albeit perhaps not as significantly, but it should be noted that the new first floor addition will be set back from the common boundary by around 1.5 metres. The face to face distance

would be around 2.5 metres taking into account the position of the flank elevation at No. 71 relative to the boundary.

- 5.15. In terms of the BRE guidance, whilst a full expert assessment has not been undertaken as it not considered necessary, it is considered that nevertheless, having regard to the guidance, the visible sky angle (measured from the centre of the window) will not be significantly affected and remains within reasonable limits.
- 5.16. The general outlook from the window is already dominated by the flank elevation of No. 69 and the proposed extension, whilst being closer, will make little difference in this respect. Therefore, the effect on 'outlook' having regard to the current relationship is not considered to be unacceptably harmful.
- 5.17. Taking into account all the above factors, it is reasonable to conclude that the revised scheme will not have an unacceptable impact on the light received and outlook from this flank bedroom window, particularly given the existing situation.
- 5.18. Policy DMHD1 Part A states that extensions to dwellings should ensure that a satisfactory relationship with adjacent dwellings is achieved and that there is no unacceptable loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers. This policy would therefore be satisfied as the above demonstrates that there would be no 'unacceptable loss' of outlook – in other words it is relevant to consider the existing situation and the impact of the change.
- 5.19. Part B(vi) of the above policy states that two storey extensions should not encroach the area provided by a 45 degree line of sight drawn from the centre of the nearest habitable windows. The application is accompanied by drawing no. 2022/1163/11B which illustrates this relationship with both adjoining properties in respect of the nearest rear facing windows. With regard to both adjoining properties, the two-storey element is well within the 45 degree line of both nearest windows on the adjoining properties. It is assumed that this flank window is not subject to this limitation and in any event, it is already encroached as explained above – there would be no significant change in this regard.
- 5.20. The revised scheme does not raise any additional issues in this regard, the scheme being considerably reduced in terms of its size, bulk and height. No windows are proposed in the flank elevations that could introduce any overlooking, the only window being one to serve a new bathroom which will be obscurely glazed. This results in an improvement on the current situation as there is currently a landing window and bathroom window in this elevation.
- 5.21. The addition of the side dormer does not introduce any issue as it will be obscurely glazed. The rear facing dormer would replicate existing relationships whereby there are already rear facing windows. This is in any event a common relationship and it is of note that dormer windows have been introduced to other properties in the road.
- 5.22. It can be concluded that the proposed extensions will have a satisfactory relationship with both adjoining dwellings. Should it be considered necessary the Appellant is happy for a conditions to be imposed to ensure the use of obscure glazing in the proposed upper level flank windows and that no further windows are inserted at these upper levels to maintain privacy.

6. Conclusions

- 6.1. The revised scheme comprises a considerably reduced size, scale and bulk compared to the previous scheme submitted in 2023.
- 6.2. It will not be disproportionately large in relation to the host dwelling nor would it look out of keeping with or be detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene. The proposals have had full regard to ensuring a high quality of design that harmonises with the host dwelling and wider street scene. In this respect it is similar to many other properties that have been extended in this part of Warren Road, particularly No. 61.
- 6.3. Whilst the proposal will have some impact on the bedroom window in the flank elevation of the adjoining property at No. 71, having regard to the particular site circumstances as outlined above, of which the Inspector dealing with the last appeal was not fully aware, this would not be such as to unacceptably impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of that property.
- 6.4. The proposal will provide enhanced accommodation for the Appellant and his family; in addition, given that the works will have to comply with the current building regulations, this will greatly improve the energy efficiency of the property.
- 6.5. Overall, the proposal will comply with the policies referred to above and ensure that a high quality development is achieved which will enhance the street scene.

APPENDICES

1. Appeal decision APP/R5510/D/23/3324611 dated 8 November 2023, 69 Warren Road.
2. Appeal decision APP/R5510/D/14/2220009 dated 19 September 2014, 61 Warren Road.