



**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION
ERECTION OF FRONT INFILL EXTENSION AND ADDITION OF A
FIRST FLOOR
30 THE DRIVE, ICKENHAM UB10 8AF**

**PLANNING STATEMENT
AUGUST 2023**

Introduction

1. This Planning Statement has been prepared in support of a householder application for a front infill extension and addition of a first floor at 30 The Drive, Ickenham, Hillingdon UB10 8AF. The application is submitted on behalf of Mr and Mrs P Lall, the landowners.
2. The application is a resubmission of revised proposals following the refusal of a previous application 51086/APP/2021/2056 by a Decision Notice dated 18 August 2021. The reasons for refusal related to concerns about (1) the size, scale, bulk and massing of the proposed extensions and their impact on the host dwelling and the visual amenities of the streetscene, and (2) impact on the amenities of neighbours due to loss of light, visual intrusion, overlooking, loss of privacy and loss of outlook.
3. The current application incorporates changes to address the Council's reasons for refusal. These changes are more fully described in this Statement which demonstrates how the revised proposals comply with national and local plan policies.

4. The changes seek to address the Council's reasons for refusal. The main changes are:
 - (1) Reduction in overall height, width and depth of the proposed building. Second floor (roof) accommodation has been removed and a catslide roof feature introduced to reduce the scale and massing of the roof particularly on the side nearest to No 28A The Drive.
 - (2) The amount of glazing in the central feature at first floor has been significantly reduced and balconies at first and second (roof) floors in the previous scheme removed.
 - (3) The revised proposals have been redesigned to lower the overall height and incorporate a cat slide roof so the proposed building remains single storey along the common boundary with No 28A. The rear extension included in the previous application has been removed.
 - (4) The revised layout plan shows that the proposals comply with the BRE 45 degree rule of thumb taken from the nearest habitable room windows in No 28A.
 - (5) The introduction of the cat slide roof, removal of first floor windows from nearest the common boundary to No 28A and removal of first floor and roof balconies shown on the previous scheme address concerns about overlooking to No 28A.
 - (6) The revised proposals provide a minimum separation distance of 24 metres between nearest habitable room windows in the proposal and No 32 to comply with Policy DMHD1(b)(vi) and there is intervening boundary vegetation and the existing garage that will further screen views.

National policy

5. NPPF para. 130 states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping and are sympathetic to local character and history including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change and optimising the potential of the site to accommodate and sustain an appropriate amount of development.

Development plan policies

6. The development plan for the purposes of S70(2) of the TCPA 1990 and S38(6) of the PCPA 2004 is the London Plan – The Spatial Development Strategy for London March 2021, the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 Strategic Policies (November 2012) and the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020).
7. The main policies relevant to the application are:

LPP D4 – Delivering good design

LPP D6 – Housing quality and standards

LPP D8 – Public realm

BE1 – Built environment

DMHB11 – Design of new development

DMHB12 – Streets and public realm

DMHB14 – Trees and landscaping

DMBH18 – Private outdoor amenity space

DMHD1 – Alterations and extensions to residential dwellings

Planning Assessment

Reason for refusal (1) - the size, scale, bulk and massing of the proposed extensions and their impact on the host dwelling and the visual amenities of the streetscene

8. The Council's policies seek to ensure that all new development complements and where possible improves the character and appearance of the area in which it is proposed. Policy DMHB11 requires all development to be designed to the highest standards and incorporate principles of good design and harmonise with the local context by taking into account the surrounding scale of development and considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures, building lines and set-backs and protecting features of positive value. Policy DMHB12 requires developments to improve legibility and ensure public realm design takes account of the established townscape character and quality of the surrounding area. Policy DMHD1 seeks to ensure that alterations and extensions to dwellings do not result in an adverse cumulative impact on the character, appearance or quality of the existing street or wider area.
9. The Officer's Delegated Report (DR) to the previous application sets out the Council's concerns. The proposals have been revised to address these concerns and ensure they would not have any detrimental effect on the character, appearance and visual amenity of the street scene and the surrounding area for the following reasons:
 - (7) The site lies within a 'Developed Area' as identified on the Hillingdon Proposals Map and is not within a conservation area or other identified Area of Special Local Character which is afforded additional protection.
 - (8) The existing dwelling is not statutorily listed or locally listed and is of limited architectural merit and has no special character or particular features of positive value worthy of protection.

- (9) The DR acknowledges there are no heritage and policy constraints.
- (10) The DR comments Nos 24-30 The Drive are bungalows with the dwellings gradually stepping deeper and there are some similarities between Nos 28, 28A and 30. However, the DR also acknowledges the context of the site which varies in form, proportion, appearance and range from bungalows to two-storey detached properties and that there are varied positions and sizes with some properties smaller than others with some buildings angled or sited deep within their plots. The DR states there is no consistency although there are some architectural features such as front gables and dormers.
- (11) This is consistent with the views of Inspectors at S78 appeals into proposed replacements and alterations to properties in The Drive. An Inspector to a S78 appeal at No. 66 The Drive (I acted as agent on this site) remarked that "the street had significant variation in style and design such that, in this context, there was scope for extending and altering the property so as to improve its appearance even where this would not reflect the existing design and appearance of the building". The Inspector determined in that case that the proposed alterations would create a new form and character for the building which can just as easily be accommodated by the area in line with Policy BE1. He further commented that "whilst the development would not harmonise with the scale, form, architectural composition and proportions of the existing building, this is not necessary in this instance as the design seeks a fundamental remodelling of the building to create a new character and appearance".
- (12) The Council, in the case of No. 66 The Drive, described the street scene as characterised by a mix of detached properties of varying designs and styles. The site is located in an area which has no uniform character or predominant house designs and where many permissions have been

granted in recent years to extend and replace original properties with larger and taller houses. The area comprises a relatively affluent private street with regular upgrading and enlarging of properties to meet the needs of residents and families.

- (13) I consider the principle of enlarging the existing property with an additional storey is therefore acceptable and would not be harmful given the varied context and character of the area which indisputably includes larger two storey properties. There is no policy which seeks the retention of bungalows and no policy justification to retaining a bungalow on this site simply because there are bungalows at Nos. 28 and 28A. There is no single or uniform pattern or character of development and I see no reason why limited two-storey development should not be acceptable here provided it is well designed and does not cause demonstrable harm to neighbouring amenity.
- (14) Although the proposals would alter the appearance of the host property, I consider they would represent a better quality and more cohesive design which would enhance the property and its contribution to the streetscene and (as the above Inspector concluded) thus the proposal can be accommodated without harm to the area in accordance with Policy BE1. Whilst the development would not fully maintain the form of the existing bungalow, this is not necessary in this instance as the design seeks a fundamental remodelling of the building to create a new character and appearance which would provide a high-quality design with good architectural composition and proportions and which would enhance the overall character of the area.
- (15) The revised proposals have reduced the overall height, width and depth of the scheme. The outline of the refused scheme is shown on the front elevation drawing 23-J4284-03. The roof accommodation included at second floor in the previous scheme has been removed which allows the

massing of the roof to be reduced. The introduction of a catslide roof feature further reduces the bulk of the building, particularly on the side nearest to No 28A The Drive.

- (16) The DR to the previous application raised concern about the amount of glazing in the central feature at first floor which was considered visually intrusive and jarring. This has been significantly reduced in the revised proposals to the front central feature (which now has casement windows to match the other windows) and with the removal of the balconies at first and second (roof) floors in the previous scheme.
- (17) The proposed materials are render to the front elevation and brick to the ground floor and weatherboarding to the first floor on the rear elevation.

Reason for refusal (2) - impact on the amenities of neighbours due to loss of light, visual intrusion, overlooking, loss of privacy and loss of outlook

- 10. The siting of a two-storey dwelling set back from the main building line clearly needs careful consideration in respect of matters such as overlooking, privacy and overbearing because of the relationship with neighbouring properties.
- 11. The proposals have been revised to take account of the Council's previous concerns and ensure that there is no unacceptable impact on neighbour amenity:
 - (1) The Council expressed concern that the previous proposal added a full additional storey and accommodation in the roof to the whole footprint of the existing bungalow. The Council considered that adequate space would be retained to the northern boundary with No. 32 but that the resultant building would be close at two-storey level to the common boundary with No 28A and together with the proposed 2.7 metre rear extension would result in a bulky, incongruous and dominant form of development.

- (2) The revised proposals have been redesigned to lower the overall height and incorporate a cat slide roof (which is characteristic of some other properties in the street) so that the proposed building remains single storey along the common boundary with No 28A. The rear extension included in the previous application has been removed.
- (3) The revised proposals comply with the BRE 45 degree rule of thumb taken from the nearest habitable room windows in No 28A as shown on the proposed layout plan 23-J4284-01.
- (4) The Council objected to habitable room windows at first floor level which it considered would overlook habitable room windows in the rear elevation of No. 28A and the garden. The introduction of the cat slide roof removes first floor windows from nearest the common boundary to No 28A. The first floor and roof balconies shown on the previous scheme have been removed. There would be limited views from the two first floor bedroom windows but these would be at an acute angle and no different to a standard arrangement between two neighbouring properties in a suburban environment. There would be no overlooking towards habitable room windows in No 28A.
- (5) The Council expressed concern about the potential overlooking and overbearing between the proposal and neighbouring occupiers of No. 32 because of the 20 metre separation distance on the previous scheme, although it acknowledged this was only fractionally below the 21 metre requirement in Policy DMHD 1(B)(vi). The revised proposals provide a minimum separation distance of 24 metres between nearest habitable room windows in the proposal and No 32 and there is intervening boundary vegetation and the existing garage that will further screen views. See layout plan 23-J4284-01. The revised proposals now comply with Policy DMHD1(b)(vi).

(6) The previous DR confirmed that the proposals would not have any detrimental impact on amenities of occupiers of properties at Nos. 40 and 42 Highfield Drive. Given the reductions in the scale and massing of these revised proposals and the removal of the rear extension it is considered the current proposals would have no detrimental impact on these properties.

Other considerations

12. The proposals meet the nationally described space standards and the London Plan's space standards in respect to both internal space and external amenity space. The DR to the previous application confirmed that adequate garden space is retained to meet policy.
13. The existing parking provision and waste/recycling bin arrangements would remain unaffected by the proposal.
14. The DR to the previous application noted that selected trees within the site are protected by TPO 292. According to the TPO schedule there are two protected trees in the front garden – T1 Scots pine and T2 Oak. The DR noted that no tree survey had been submitted but there would be no direct impact on the protected trees due to the set back of the building. Tree protection measures would be required in order to protect the trees from damage during construction and can be secured by a planning condition.

Conclusion

15. The revised proposals address the Council's concerns to the previous application by making significant reductions to the height, width and depth of the proposed building removing the rear extension and second floor (roof) accommodation, introducing a catslide roof feature, reducing window sizes and removing balconies. The appearance of the house will change but I do not consider this would be harmful to the character of the street scene and the wider

area such as to justify refusal of planning permission given the variations in designs and styles and noting that this is not a conservation area or area of special local character to be afforded additional protection. The proposals would provide a high quality design which would better harmonise the design of the property and would incorporate architectural features which are commonly found in the street. Overall the proposals would enhance the street scene.

16. The reduced proposals would not result in any unacceptable harm to the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties. The proposed building is only single storey along the common boundary with No 28A Drive and complies with the BRE 45 degree rule of thumb. Balconies have been removed and window sizes reduced. The separation distance of 24 metres to No 32 The Drive exceeds the Policy DMHB1(B)(vi) standard.
17. For the above reasons I conclude the proposals would not result in unacceptable harm to the character of the street scene and the wider area and therefore it complies with Hillingdon policies BE1, DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 and London Plan policies D4 and D8.

Paul Dickinson
BA (Hons) MRTPI MRICS MCMI
9 August 2023