

PLANNING SUPPORT STATEMENT:
Retrospective Planning Application for the Retention of an Outbuilding

At

**57 Warren Road,
Ickenham,
UB10 8AD**

For

Mr S Rauli

Ref. MW.2026.014/PSS Rev A
01 April 2026

Project Summary

This application seeks retrospective planning permission for the retention of a single-storey outbuilding used for incidental purposes (playroom/gym). The structure falls marginally outside permitted development provisions due solely to its proximity to the boundary; in all other respects (use, scale, height and domestic character) it aligns closely with what could otherwise be constructed under Class E.

The outbuilding is modest, subordinate, and not visible from the public realm. It does not give rise to material harm in terms of residential amenity, visual impact, or character of the area. As such, the proposal accords with Policies BE1, DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHB 14, as well as the design objectives of the NPPF.

Given the limited nature of the breach, the clear fallback position, and the absence of demonstrable harm, the development is considered acceptable in planning terms. Approval is therefore respectfully recommended.

1. Introduction

This Planning Support Statement has been prepared in support of a retrospective planning application for the retention of an outbuilding at 57 Warren Road, Ickenham.

The application has been submitted following correspondence from the Local Planning Authority (London Borough of Hillingdon) regarding an alleged breach of planning control under Part 1, Class E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

2. Description of Development

The development comprises a single-storey outbuilding located within the rear garden of the host dwelling. The building is used for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse, specifically as a playroom and home gym.

The structure is domestic in nature and remains clearly ancillary and subordinate to the main dwelling.

3. Planning Background and Context

The applicant acknowledges that the outbuilding does not fully comply with permitted development tolerances, specifically in relation to its proximity to the boundary. However, the development is otherwise broadly consistent with the limitations set out under Class E, including its scale, height, and incidental use. The applicant was not aware that the development required planning permission and had been misinformed at the time works were undertaken. Had they been aware, they would have sought the appropriate consent in advance. Upon receipt of the Council's correspondence, the applicant has acted promptly, engaging professional advice and submitting this retrospective application in good faith.

4. Policy Context

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies (2012)

- **Policy BE1 (Built Environment)** seeks to ensure that all new development improves the quality of the built environment and integrates well with the surrounding area.

Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Development Management Policies (2020)

- **Policy DMHB 11 (Design of New Development)** requires all development to be of a high-quality design that responds to the local context and does not adversely impact the character of the area.
- **Policy DMHB 12 (Streets and Spaces)** supports development that maintains or enhances the visual amenity and quality of the surrounding environment.
- **Policy DMHB 14 (Residential Amenity)** ensures that development does not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers in terms of outlook, privacy, or daylight.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The NPPF promotes high-quality, well-designed developments that are sympathetic to local character and create a high standard of amenity for existing and future users (Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places).

5. Assessment Against Policy

Local Precedent

A review of recent planning decisions within Ickenham and the surrounding area demonstrates that outbuildings of a similar nature are regularly approved by the Local Planning Authority. These include both full planning permissions and certificates of lawful development for structures within front and rear gardens used for incidental residential purposes.

Such decisions (ie 54716/APP/2025/2494) confirm that outbuildings are acceptable in principle within this established residential context. Furthermore, they demonstrate that where proposals fall marginally outside permitted development tolerances, planning permission is often granted where no material harm arises. The current proposal aligns with this established pattern of development. Notably, the only area of non-compliance relates to a minor technical deviation in boundary proximity, with all other aspects (scale, height, use and domestic character) closely reflecting what could be achieved under permitted development.

In this context, the proposal is consistent with the prevailing character of development in the area and reinforces the conclusion that it is acceptable in planning terms.

Design and Character (BE1, DMHB 11 & DMHB 12)

The outbuilding is modest in scale and typical of domestic garden structures. It is located to the rear of the property and is not visible from the public realm. Its design and materials are in keeping with a residential setting and do not detract from the character or appearance of the surrounding area. As such, the proposal complies with Policies BE1, DMHB 11, and DMHB 12.

Impact on Residential Amenity (DMHB 14)

The structure is single-storey and used for low-intensity, incidental residential purposes. It does not give rise to material overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing, or overbearing impacts. The relationship with neighbouring properties remains acceptable, and the development is therefore consistent with Policy DMHB 14.

Permitted Development Context (Material Consideration)

While the outbuilding does not fully meet the technical requirements of permitted development due to its proximity to the boundary, it is otherwise very close to compliance. This fallback position is a material consideration and demonstrates that the development is broadly acceptable in principle.

6. Applicant's Approach and Engagement

The applicant wishes to emphasise their proactive and cooperative approach. They were unaware of the breach and had relied on incorrect information at the time of construction. Upon being notified, they have taken immediate steps to regularise the situation through this application.

A photo sheet has been submitted to support the application, and the applicant would welcome the opportunity for a site visit. They are happy to meet with a Planning Officer on site to discuss the development and assist in the assessment process.

7. Conclusion

Although the development does not strictly comply with permitted development criteria due to a minor technical breach relating to boundary proximity, it is otherwise acceptable in planning terms.

The outbuilding is modest, subordinate, and appropriate within its context. It does not harm the character of the area or the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and aligns with the relevant policies of the Hillingdon Local Plan and the NPPF.

The applicant has acted in good faith and has taken prompt steps to address the matter. In light of the above, it is respectfully requested that retrospective planning permission be granted.

8. Planning Balance and Very Special Circumstances

In considering the planning balance, it is important to recognise that the identified breach is limited to a minor technical deviation from permitted development criteria relating solely to boundary proximity. The development is otherwise fully aligned with the intent of permitted development rights and is acceptable in terms of scale, height, use, and overall impact.

There are no material planning harms arising from the development. It does not adversely impact neighbouring amenity, visual character, or the wider streetscene. As such, there is no substantive policy conflict when assessed against the Development Plan as a whole.

Significant weight should also be given to the fallback position that a very similar structure could be erected under permitted development with only limited alteration. This reinforces the conclusion that the development is acceptable in principle.

Furthermore, the applicant has acted in good faith throughout. The breach arose unintentionally due to a misunderstanding, and prompt steps have been taken to regularise the situation through engagement with the Council and submission of this application. This positive and cooperative approach is a material consideration in favour of granting permission.

On balance, the absence of demonstrable harm, combined with the fallback position and the applicant's proactive approach, clearly weighs in favour of approval.

Ends