

DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT

Proposed Householder Development
Site: 88 Stormount Drive, Hayes, Middlesex, UB3 1RH

1. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

No. 88 Stormount Drive is a semi-detached dwelling physically attached to No. 90. No. 86 forms a separate semi-detached pair and is not attached to the application property. The property is located at the end of Stormount Drive, an unclassified residential road within an established suburban context. Denbigh Drive and Conway Drive form part of the immediate residential setting. The rear of the site abuts an established railway corridor and does not face neighbouring residential gardens. As such, the rear relationship is materially less sensitive than a typical garden-to-garden arrangement.

2. PLANNING HISTORY

The site benefits from historic planning permissions granted in 1994 for side and rear extensions under references 38576/D/94/1080 and 38576/B/94/0399. These permissions establish the lawful built form and extended envelope of the dwelling.

3. EXISTING AND PROPOSED RELATIONSHIP TO NO. 86

The existing separation distance between No. 88 and No. 86 measures approximately 6.4 metres at ground-floor level. At first-floor level, the existing stepped form increases the separation to approximately 10.07 metres.

The proposed first-floor extension aligns vertically above the established ground-floor flank wall, resulting in a consistent separation distance of approximately 6.45 metres at both ground and first-floor levels. This separation remains materially generous within a suburban context and retains a clearly perceptible visual gap between the two dwellings.

The proposal preserves the established rhythm of development and avoids any terracing effect. The spatial relationship between properties remains legible and proportionate, and the visual break between built forms is maintained.

4. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Ground Floor: The proposal comprises a modest front porch with a pitched roof reflecting the form and proportions of the existing elevation, and a rear extension measuring approximately 2.0 metres in depth by 9.2 metres in width. The rear element incorporates a lightweight glazed roof component to reduce visual bulk and maintain a subordinate appearance.

First Floor: The proposal includes a side and rear first-floor extension constructed above the established ground-floor footprint. The extension is partially wrap-around in form but does not breach the 45-degree assessment line. Additional rooflights are proposed at ground and roof level. There is no increase in overall ridge height. The internal reconfiguration enhances functionality while maintaining a restrained and contextually appropriate external envelope.

5. POLICY ASSESSMENT – DMHD1 AND DMHD2

The proposal has been assessed having regard to the intent and objectives of Policies DMHD1 and DMHD2. These policies seek to ensure that residential extensions remain subordinate to the host dwelling, avoid terracing, retain meaningful separation, and safeguard residential amenity. The proposal retains a first-floor separation distance of approximately 6.45 metres, does not increase the overall ridge height, integrates coherently with the existing roof form, and preserves the established spatial relationship between dwellings.

When assessed against the objectives of DMHD1 and DMHD2, the development does not result in material harm to character, appearance, or neighbour amenity. Relevant local precedents and officer reasoning are summarised separately within the submitted Precedent Reference Schedule.

The assessment of compliance with Policies DMHD1 and DMHD2 has been undertaken with emphasis on design outcome, retained separation, roof coherence, and demonstrable absence of neighbor harm.

The proposal satisfies the core objectives of Policy DMHD1 by remaining subordinate in scale, retaining a meaningful spatial gap, avoiding cumulative terracing, and preserving the established semi-detached character of the street.

6. NEIGHBOUR AMENITY AND DAYLIGHT

The proposal has been carefully designed to safeguard neighbouring residential amenity. Its scale and positioning ensure there is no unacceptable loss of daylight or outlook, consistent with the Council's 45-degree assessment approach.

The submitted drawings demonstrate that the proposal does not breach the 45-degree line and no unacceptable loss of daylight would arise.

The proposal does not introduce harmful overlooking. Existing boundary vegetation will be retained wherever practicable as a material screening measure. Where removal is necessary, replacement planting of equivalent screening value will be provided.

Given the railway corridor to the rear, there are no rear-facing residential receptors that would experience privacy impacts.

The presence of the established railway corridor to the rear materially reduces sensitivity when compared to typical garden-to-garden relationships, further reinforcing the absence of rear amenity harm.

7. JUSTIFICATION FOR NO 1 METRE FIRST-FLOOR SET-BACK

Policy guidance often refers to a 1 metre first-floor set-back as one possible means of avoiding a terracing effect. However, this dimensional approach is not a mandatory requirement and must be applied with regard to context and design outcome.

In this case, the proposal achieves the underlying objective of the guidance through retained separation, preservation of roof hierarchy, and continued visual articulation between dwellings. A clear spatial gap of approximately 6.45 metres is maintained, the ridge height remains unchanged, and the extension reads as a coherent continuation of the established built form.

Introducing a nominal set-back would not provide additional amenity benefit and would disrupt the architectural balance of the dwelling. The proposal therefore satisfies the intent of the guidance through outcome-based compliance rather than rigid dimensional application.

8. RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The scale, siting and massing of the proposal ensure there is no unacceptable loss of outlook or privacy to neighbouring occupiers. The development remains proportionate within its plot and does not prejudice the development potential of adjoining properties.

9. PRECEDENT AND LOCAL CONTEXT

Relevant planning precedents within the immediate locality and wider borough demonstrate a consistent officer approach that prioritises design outcome, retained separation, avoidance of terracing, amenity protection, and roof coherence.

Recent approvals within the immediate locality demonstrate that rear extensions exceeding SPD depth guidance have been supported where separation and neighbour impact are acceptable. The Council's approach reflects a balanced application of Policy DMHD1, with emphasis placed on design outcome and retained spatial relationships rather than rigid dimensional thresholds. These precedents confirm that first-floor extensions without rigid dimensional set-backs can be acceptable where spatial relationships and visual separation are preserved. The submitted Precedent Reference Schedule explains explicitly how each cited decision relates to the current proposal.

10. REAR BUILDING LINE CONTEXT

The rear building line within the immediate locality is not uniform. Surrounding properties, including those on Denbigh Drive, exhibit varied depths and rear extensions that establish a mixed pattern of development.

The proposal sits comfortably within this established context and does not project beyond the prevailing rear development pattern in a manner that would appear incongruous or overbearing. The relationship to neighbouring properties remains proportionate and visually contained.

The rear railway corridor further reduces sensitivity when compared to typical garden-to-garden relationships, reinforcing the contextual acceptability of the proposal

11. CONCLUSION

The proposal represents a carefully considered, context-led householder extension. It builds upon an established lawful baseline, retains meaningful separation to No. 86, preserves roof hierarchy, avoids terracing, and safeguards neighbouring amenity including daylight considerations.

The proposal would not result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or the surrounding area, nor to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

The development accords fully with the objectives of Policies DMHD1 and DMHD2 and reflects the Council's established decision-making approach within the locality. Approval is therefore respectfully sought.