

DESIGN AND ACCESS / PLANNING STATEMENT

Site Address: 97 Park Lane, Hayes, Hillingdon, UB4 8AE

Proposal: Erection of a full-width 6-metre single-storey rear extension following demolition of the existing rear extension and garage (revision to modify approved application ref: 21437/APP/2026/16 to fill in the previous corner notch/setback).

Applicant: G Thind

1. Introduction & Executive Summary

This statement has been prepared to support a householder planning application for a revised single-storey rear extension layout at 97 Park Lane. The property recently secured planning approval under application **Ref: 21437/APP/2026/16** on 12th February 2026. During that application's determination process, the Council requested amendments that resulted in a large notch/setback being cut out of the rear corner footprint, providing a stepped depth (minimum 3.6m depth along the northern boundary, extending out to a maximum 6m depth).

This revised submission seeks planning permission to construct a **consistent, un-stepped full-width 6-metre deep extension**. The specific purpose of filling this notch is an urgent, compassionate need to provide an accessible ground floor bedroom and integrated wet-room washing facilities to accommodate the safe, long-term home care of the homeowner's elderly, dependent mother.

2. Site Context & Relevant Planning History

The application site features a two-storey semi-detached property situated on the western side of Park Lane, Hayes. The surrounding street scene is highly varied, with several neighbouring properties exhibiting extensive, deep single-storey rear additions.

Recent Planning History for the Site:

- **21437/APP/2026/16:** *Erection of rear extension, following the demolition of existing rear extension and detached garage. **Granted 12th February 2026.*** This approved design featured an 'L-shaped' footprint yielding a 3.6m depth on the northern boundary and a 6m maximum depth.
- **21437/APP/2025/3203:** *Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include hip-to-gable extension and rear dormer. **Lawful Development Certificate Issued.***

3. Proposed Design & Access Details

The revised proposal maintains the height parameters established and deemed acceptable by the Local Planning Authority under the recent approval:

- **Depth:** A uniform 6.00 metres across the entire rear elevation of the property.
- **Height:** A maximum flat roof height of 3.00 metres, integrating a flat roof light.
- **Materials:** External finishes, including brickwork and glazing profiles, will perfectly match the host dwelling to satisfy local character policies.
- **Access/Inclusivity:** The core layout amendment replaces the previously approved "notch" to establish a level-access, private ground-floor living quarter tailored to an elderly individual with limited mobility. This configuration optimizes inner space to support standard medical/care equipment and clear turning circles for washing facilities.

4. Planning Policy Framework & Material Considerations

Local Plan Policy Alignment

The primary guidance for this development is found under **Policy DMHD 1** (*Alterations and Extensions of Dwellings*) and **Policy DMHB 11** (*Design*) of the **Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two (2020)**.

While Policy DMHD 1 typically limits single-storey rear extensions on semi-detached houses with a plot width over 5m to a standard depth of 3.6 metres, the policy allows for deviations when robust material planning considerations, local precedents, and extenuating personal circumstances dictate.

Established Precedents within Hillingdon Borough

A strict, rigid enforcement of the 3.6-metre depth threshold is not reflective of the immediate context. Hillingdon Council has frequently granted planning permissions for full 6-metre deep single-storey extensions when balanced against site conditions or nearby precedent:

1. **29 Gledwood Avenue (Ref: 38719/APP/2023/1102):** The Council approved a full 6m deep single-storey rear extension on the basis that deep rear additions were prominent within the immediate vicinity.
2. **68 Gledwood Avenue (Ref: 66895/APP/2025/1153):** A 6m single-storey rear extension was explicitly approved by the LPA, confirming that the built context tolerates this scale without harming the broader street pattern.
3. **78 Dickens Avenue (Ref: 51439/APP/2023/1088):** A full 6m deep extension with a flat roof/lantern was approved on balance, acknowledging that notable 6m deep forms were an active character trait of the borough's residential clusters.
4. **20 Clement Gardens, Hayes (Ref: 47966/APP/2025/2194):** An explicit application for a full-width, 6-metre single-storey rear extension was approved on balance despite exceeding Policy DMHD 1 criteria, with officers citing specific mitigating circumstances.

Residential Amenity & Impact

Because the extension strictly adheres to a flat-roof height of 3.0m, it avoids casting an adverse, overbearing shadow or causing a significant loss of light to adjacent occupiers. The removal of the notch will not cause harmful overlooking, and access to the flat roof can be conditioned solely for emergency or maintenance tasks, matching the conditions applied to the prior approval.

5. Extenuating Personal Circumstances & Case Law

The primary driver of this revision is the provision of essential human care. The previously approved notched layout forces an inner bottleneck, rendering the ground floor incapable of securely hosting a standard medical bed layout alongside localized bathroom access.

Human Rights & Weight of Medical Need

Under the **Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA 1998)**—which Hillingdon explicitly notes binds its planning decisions—the Council must avoid acting incompatibly with Convention rights, notably Article 8 (Right to respect for private and family life).

While planning permissions generally attach to the land rather than the individual, established High Court and Planning Inspectorate case law dictates that personal medical hardships and elderly care needs constitute valid "very special/extenuating circumstances" that carry considerable material weight.

Supporting Case Law & Appeal Precedents

1. **Deakin v First Secretary of State [2006] EWHC 3402 (Admin):** This case established that personal and medical circumstances of an applicant must be fully evaluated as material considerations when a refusal would generate a disproportionate hardship on family care.
2. **Glebe Fields, Churchill Lane Appeal (Decision Date: Jan 2026):** In a recent binding appeal decision, the Inspector ruled that the exceptional personal medical circumstances of an occupant (supported by medical confirmation showing that an existing home layout cannot safely accommodate required care/mobility adaptations) carry substantial weight. The Inspector noted that ensuring an individual can maintain a crucial role in family life and receive care at home sufficiently justifies departures from rigid local development frameworks.

The applicant is fully prepared to provide confidential NHS documentation or occupational therapist assessments directly to the planning officer to substantiate the physical necessity of this ground-floor room layout if requested.

6. Conclusion

The principle of a single-storey rear extension up to 6 metres deep at this exact location has already been assessed and fundamentally accepted by Hillingdon Council under application



LANDMARK
— GROUP —

PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT - ARCHITECTURE - BUILDING REGULATIONS - STRUCTURAL DESIGN - INTERIORS

21437/APP/2026/16. Squaring off the previously mandated corner notch adds negligible volumetric bulk to the overall site profile, yet it comprehensively solves a critical, time-sensitive care crisis for an elderly relative.

Given the wealth of 6m precedents across Hayes, the total lack of amenity harm, and the overriding compassionate grounds supported by the HRA 1998 and planning case law, we respectfully request that the Local Planning Authority grants approval for this minor but crucial layout revision.

32B STATION ROAD, GERRARDS CROSS, BUCKINGHAMSHIRE, SL9 8EL

INFO@LANDMARK-GROUP.CO.UK

01753 392292

WWW.LANDMARK-GROUP.CO.UK