

**A DESIGN AND ACCESS
STATEMENT
FOR A SINGLE STOREY,
REAR EXTENSION
NEAR FULL ORIGINAL HOUSE
WIDTH BY 5.00 METRE DEPTH.
AT
6, GARTH CLOSE,
RUISLIP, MIDDLESEX HA 4 9 PT.
FOR
MR. ANTHONY MULLIN.**

Soarbond Limited,
17, Clarendon Road,
Ealing,
London W5 1 AA.
Tel: 020 8997 8663
E Mail: soarbond@yahoo.co.uk

Project No	Revision	Date	Prepared By	Checked By	Status
1716	----A-----	08-03-21	K. Zablocki	Initials: 	Final

CONTENTS

SHEET

1.0	Part 1 - Design Statement.....	03
2.0	Part 2 - Access Statement.....	07

Part 1

1.0 Design Statement.

1.1 Outline.

The subject property is a semi-detached house on the western side of a cul-de-sac road running westwards from Cardinal Road in Eastcote which is part of Ruislip. Situated in the middle of a C3 housing estate, this property is outside a conservation area. It appears also that the house is not listed nor locally listed. The houses, here, were built generally within the last 60-70 years and employed a traditional form of construction i.e. brick / block work walling under timber pitched roofs covered in fired sand/cement/clay tiles with timber suspended floor joists and tongue and groove floor boards etc. There is extensive painted render on the outside of the house on the three main elevations.

The houses are generally two storey, small to medium sized, family dwellings with a generous rear garden. There is a single storey garage and shed outbuildings at the rear and the space between houses has been utilized as car access. The garage outbuilding is to be demolished after the first phase of the redevelopment is completed and before phase 2.

The Applicant understands that he cannot take advantage of the Government's proposals for Prior Approval (PA) as Hillingdon has covered the whole borough with an Article 4 Directive not allowing PA anywhere. Consequently, the Applicant has to make a full Householder's Planning Application for a rear, ground floor extension.

Here, the drawings 1716 / 1 to 6 now reflect what is existing and prior to the works commencing after approval by Hillingdon for details shown on drawings 1716 / 11A to 16A.

We are seeking to make this property more efficient in layout at ground floor by increasing the line of the principal rear elevation by 5.0 metres. The gross nett floor area increase will still be below 25 m² etc. after demolition of the small 5.5 square metre previous extension.

It should be noted that, at the end boundary, there are three properties adjoining this end boundary. So, in total there are five properties that adjoin the boundaries of number 6 if we include the two direct neighbours adjoining this property at 5 and 7.

We intend to maintain a 3.0 metre maximum height to the extension with an anticipated 2.95 metre height at gutter that will run along the end of the extension on three sides.

The proposed, rear extension will be constructed so that its location is partially hidden from most of the houses and garages on this cul-de-sac. The houses situated on this estate are moderately well spaced out so its massing and impact on the estate at this location is, consequently, greatly reduced.

The ground floor layout now becomes a regular shape and will help reduce heating costs, CO2 footprint and heat house emissions and burnt gases etc.

We will carry out a full check to ensure there is a reduction in the CO2 footprint, heat losses and increase in air-tightness and supply further extensive insulation for this " Updated House ".

As above, reference is made to a few of the neighbouring properties where single storey, rear and side extensions have been made; usually incorporating the rear garden garage. Please refer to No.7.

It is important to stress that most homes are used as single family dwellings in this neighbourhood. There are, however, commercial interests situated at the Field End Road and Elm Avenue / North View intersection where Eastcote underground station is located.

The appearance of this semi-detached house leads us to believe that it was a typical " aspirational type of house " built on this estate with some variations to the frontages (mostly Mock Tudor styling) and to the sides. This implies that many residents who, having purchased their homes off the jobbing Builder, carried out more than cosmetic changes. Their dwellings, therefore, we must assume, have changed quite a lot to suit their Owner's requirements. So, where there have been changes, these have established precedence.

None of the houses have a lot of particularly interesting architectural features nor distinguishing patterns or marks. They were built as Post War aspirational housing before those words became popular!!!! The windows are now double glazed, uPVC framed, casement windows and the same can be said for the doors to the front and rear. This is all typical supply to outdated estate housing provision of timber doors and windows.

Along with phase 2 already applied for, these extensions will define the regular shape of the enlarged house. It will give this property a more elegant, more practical and more useful, overall application at the rear.

At present, there is a reasonably sized rear garden which will allow the 50 % build consideration to be satisfied easily. The frontage is completely unused as a garden and has provision for " off street " parking. There is a concreted pathway to the front door. All this becomes clear when looking at the location and site block plans.

The question of overlooking is diminished here as this is a semi detached house with no neighbours close by to the rear and to the front. The development here will have only two new side windows at 1.7 metres to sill level and a full sliding, folding rear door. The neighbours will not be overlooked.

The design of this extension here has focused on carrying out the government's and planners' explicit requirements that similar and completely balanced extensions are proposed to assist " up to date " modern living. We have referred to the comments and directives by other planners for this proposed rear extension work and incorporated same within our scheme.

The proposed addition, we would argue, does not cause any serious loss of amenity to any of the other residents or neighbours; it does not alter the street scene out of step with other similar developments on this or other roads, say, and it satisfies more sensible, modern living requirements.

This development will have no effect, nor fundamentally upset the provisions for waste removal, cycle storage, pedestrian access, overlooking (as the neighbours at the front, side and rear are at a fair distance away) or transportation needs. No further car parking spaces will be needed to be generated on the estate's roads. The family will make use of existing " off street " parking provision to the " front garden ".

All other considerations, which cover this request for planning now before the Local Authority, should be allowable if sufficiently well designed or of a small stature (as here) so as not to injure the amenity enjoyed by the neighbourhood.

1.2 Building Assessment.

This existing, semi detached, dwelling house, does have traditional framing and cladding. It has been built using brick/block and timber framing with sand/cement/clay fired roof tiles to form a single family dwelling. It has been easy to ascertain what are the original features of the house as it has not been extensively redeveloped to date. Consequently, the addition of a nett 25m2 regularised ground floor, rear extension will not demote the value of the adjoining properties and, in fact, raise them! The works here will ensure that a updated house will be made to fit sympathetically into the scheme of things on the estate.

The boundary walls are generally in timber fencing.

We understand that the house floors are in timber joists spanning from front to back onto load bearing sleeper or division walls. Some main walls are to be removed within the house to give an " open plan " aspect.

The roof over the main portion of the property has been checked and found to be a pitched (front to back), timber truss framing and covered in tiling.

1.3 Design Considerations and Alterations.

This house's further extension has been designed in sympathy with the neighbouring properties (i.e. number 7) where they have already had extensions built. The extension will generally mimic the layout of the neighbours on the estate etc.

1.4 Amenity Considerations.

The erection of this needed extension will not detract from the amenity enjoyed by the neighbours but enhance it, we would claim. It will allow them to use their properties and gardens in peace and quiet nor suffer increased overlooking from the subject application site.

1.5 Consultation.

The house owner has consulted with his nearest neighbours concerning the erection of this proposal. The Owner at 5 has accepted the works for the extension will not affect him greatly. There have been no negative complaints passed to the Owner to date from others and it would appear (based on 7's application) that LPA did not receive any serious objections.

Part 2

2.0 Access Statement.

- 2.1** The house is in the middle of what can be called a large estate. Public transport, i.e. buses 282 and 398 during the day except Sundays, is available nearby on Field End Road. To reach the trains i.e. the tube, there is a reasonable walk to the Underground at Eastcote. This station serves the Metropolitan and Piccadilly lines and gives connection to Overground lines at Harrow on the Hill.
- 2.2** The provision for parking is afforded on all the estate roads. Cardinal and Castleton Roads have no parking restrictions at the moment and it is possible to park anywhere away from the front of the house etc. With no road restrictions, however, there still appears to be little call for extensive parking anywhere on the estate during the day or great difficulty at night either.
- 2.3** Access to the upper floors is by a single staircase rising within the house. The stairs rise from ground to second where the loft has been utilized as habitable space. All of this is typical and occurs in many properties in Britain. Disabled access to this house is not required.