

# Design Statement

## Proposed Upper Storey Extension

**Property:** 154 Eastcote Road, Ruislip, UK

---

### 1. Introduction

This Design Statement has been prepared in support of a planning application for development at 154 Eastcote Road, Ruislip. The proposal comprises an upper storey extension to the existing dwelling, together with a modest front porch extension, a single storey rear extension, and the erection of a garden room/studio at the foot of the garden.

This application has been developed following careful consideration of the comments provided by the planning officer in relation to the previously submitted and subsequently withdrawn planning application (Planning Application Reference: **637/APP/2025/2603**) and also the comments received during the Pre – Planning Application process .

All matters raised at that time have been fully reviewed and addressed through revisions to the design and supporting information.

The purpose of this statement is to demonstrate that the proposed works respond positively to the established character of Eastcote Road, respect the amenities of neighbouring properties, and comply with relevant local and national planning policy through a careful, proportionate, and design-led approach. The applicant is keen to work constructively with the Council to address any remaining concerns and to achieve a successful planning outcome.

---

---

### 2. Site and Context

154 Eastcote Road is located within a predominantly residential area characterised by a mix of architectural styles, ages, and building heights. While some properties are single storey, there is a clear and established presence of two-storey dwellings along Eastcote Road.

As illustrated in the submitted streetscape and elevation drawings (Existing North Elevation), the application property is directly flanked by two-storey dwellings on both sides. This clearly demonstrates that the immediate street context is not defined by a uniform bungalow character, but by varied building heights that include full two-storey houses.

The existing single-storey form of No. 154 therefore appears as an anomaly within the immediate context, rather than forming part of a consistent low-rise character. The proposal seeks to respond positively to this established pattern.

---

### 3. Proposed Development

The proposal seeks permission for the addition of an upper storey extension to the existing dwelling. The design has been developed to sit comfortably within the existing building envelope and street context, without resulting in overdevelopment of the site.

Key features of the proposal include: - A scale and massing that aligns with neighbouring two-storey properties - Roof form, proportions, and detailing designed to reflect the surrounding built environment - Materials selected to complement the existing dwelling and adjacent houses .

In response to the comments received during Pre Planning , the crown element has been replaced with a traditional hip roof with a slightly higher ridge line .

---

### 4. Design Rationale

The primary design objective is to create a balanced and proportionate extension that integrates seamlessly with the existing house and the wider street scene.

As demonstrated in the proposed north elevation, the additional storey has been carefully designed to remain visually subordinate to the scale and ridge heights of the neighbouring two-storey dwellings. The overall height and massing are comparable to adjacent properties and do not exceed the established envelope visible along this part of Eastcote Road.

The hipped roof form reflects the traditional domestic roofscape present within the street and softens the overall mass of the building, ensuring that the extension does not appear box-like or visually intrusive. This conservative approach to roof design reinforces the residential character of the proposal and allows it to sit comfortably between the contrasting architectural styles of the neighbouring properties.

It is also noted that a mature tree is located to the front of the property, which provides a strong element of soft landscaping within the street scene. The presence of this tree further softens the visual impact of the proposed two-storey form when viewed from the public realm, helping to filter views of the building and reduce the perceived scale of the development.

Rather than introducing an incongruous form, the proposal fills a visual gap within the street, improving the rhythm and coherence of development by aligning No. 154 with the prevailing two-storey context.

In addition, No. 154 is set back further from the highway when compared with No. 156 to its eastern side. This increased setback reduces the perceived scale of the building when viewed from the public realm, meaning that the additional storey will appear visually lower and less prominent than neighbouring development. The set-back position therefore further mitigates any potential impact on street scene or character.

The design also intentionally maintains a reduced eaves height to the upper storey. By keeping the eaves at the minimum necessary height, the perceived bulk of the building is softened and the transition between ground and upper floors is visually restrained. This approach ensures that the extension reads as modest and proportionate, reinforcing its subordinate appearance within the streetscape.

---

## 5. Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

The proposal has been assessed with careful consideration of neighbouring amenity. Due to the alignment with existing two-storey neighbouring properties, the extension will not result in an unacceptable loss of light, privacy, or outlook.

Window placement and roof geometry have been considered to minimise any potential overlooking, while the overall height remains consistent with surrounding development along Eastcote Road.

---

## 6. Streetscape and Visual Impact

When viewed from the public realm, the proposed upper storey integrates successfully into the existing streetscape. The comparison between the existing and proposed north elevations clearly demonstrates that the proposal does not introduce excessive height, bulk, or visual dominance.

The development remains subordinate to the neighbouring two-storey dwelling to the east (156) and is visually less dominant than the modern flat-roofed dwelling to the west. (152) This ensures that the proposal respects the hierarchy of built form along Eastcote Road.

Fenestration proportions, spacing, and alignment have been carefully considered to reflect the established residential character of the street. The proposal avoids overly large or irregular openings, ensuring that the building reads as a conventional family dwelling rather than an overdeveloped or attention-seeking structure.

Overall, the proposal enhances streetscape coherence by resolving the abrupt change in building height creating a transitional height between the adjoining buildings and by reinforcing the established pattern of two-storey development along this part of the road .

---

## 7. Planning Policy Considerations

The proposal aligns with local planning policies that support well-designed residential extensions where they respect local character, safeguard amenity, and are appropriately scaled.

---

### 7A. Front Porch Extension

The proposal includes a modest front porch extension designed to improve the functionality and appearance of the dwelling while remaining proportionate and subordinate to the host building.

The porch projects 580 mm beyond the existing porch line and has a total area of less than 3 m<sup>2</sup> . The roof is a simple hipped roof , with a maximum height of less than 3m and a minimum height of approximately 2.1m. This restrained scale and height ensure that the porch does not appear visually dominant and remains clearly ancillary to the main dwelling.

The design and detailing of the porch respect the character of the property and the street, and the introduction of a new entrance door and garage door will enhance the appearance of the frontage, contributing positively to the streetscape.

---

### 7B. Rear Extension

The proposal also includes a single-storey rear extension which is located away from the public realm and therefore has no impact on the character or appearance of the street scene. Its siting to the rear ensures that visual effects are limited and that the primary consideration is neighbouring amenity.

The rear extension does not extend beyond the footprint of the existing dining room, which was itself previously extended with the benefit of planning permission granted in 2021 (Planning Application Reference: **637/APP/2021/703**). The current proposal therefore formalises and builds upon an established and approved depth of development at the rear of the property, rather than introducing a new or increased projection.

In order to ensure that the extension is not visually intrusive to the neighbouring property at No. 156, the proposed structure is offset from the shared boundary wall by a minimum distance of **2.2 metres** at its closest point. The height of the rear extension is restricted to

**3.0 metres**, ensuring a modest and subordinate form that avoids any sense of enclosure or overbearing impact.

It is also noted that there is an existing gazebo structure on the site with an approximate height of **2.8 metres**, located in close proximity to the neighbouring boundary, which is to be removed as part of the proposal. In comparison, the proposed rear extension will be set significantly further away from the boundary and will therefore be less visually apparent from the neighbouring garden than the existing gazebo.

Should the Council consider it necessary, the applicant is willing to increase the boundary fence height from the existing **1.8 metres to 2.0 metres** along this section, further mitigating any potential perception of visual impact.

The BRE-compliant sunlight study confirms that the rear extension does not result in any significant loss of sunlight to the neighbouring property. In addition, the Visual Impact document illustrates comparative views from both the garden and the habitable bedroom on the first floor of 156, under existing and proposed scenarios. It clearly demonstrates that the rear extension does not materially affect outlook or visual amenity. The presence of two huge trees near the common fence further reduces the visual presence of the rear extension.

Overall, by virtue of its limited height, generous boundary offset, and removal of an existing taller structure, the rear extension is considered to be a respectful and neighbourly form of development that does not give rise to planning harm.

It is also noted that there is an existing holly tree located close to the external wall of the proposed rear extension. The tree has a girth of less than **75 cm** and is therefore not subject to statutory protection. Should it be required to facilitate the development or requested by the Council, the applicant is willing to relocate the tree, ensuring that there is no adverse impact on landscaping or local amenity.

---

## 7C. Sunlight and Daylight Assessment

A BRE compliant Daylight and Sunlight assessment has been undertaken and is attached.

The assessment demonstrates full compliance with the relevant BRE 209 (2022) daylight, sunlight and amenity sunlight criteria.

The proposed development would retain acceptable levels of daylight and sunlight to the neighbouring properties at 152 and 156 Eastcote Road, with no material

adverse impact identified. On this basis, the proposal is considered acceptable in daylight and sunlight terms.

---

## 7D. Comparison with Permitted Development Fallback (Rear Dormer Scenarios)

As part of the design development, further study models were prepared to assess realistic **permitted development (PD) fallback positions** that could be implemented without the need for planning permission. It is noted that there is **no Article 4 Direction currently in place that restricts roof extensions or hip-to-gable conversions** for this property, and the site is not located within a Conservation Area. As such, the PD scenarios assessed represent genuine and lawful fallback positions available to the applicant.

**PD Option 1** involves the conversion of the existing hipped roof to a gabled roof, together with a rear dormer extension. **PD Option 2** consists of the insertion of a rear dormer extension to the existing hipped roof. Both scenarios represent lawful and realistic fallback positions that could be carried out as of right under permitted development provisions.

The Comparative Study Document 1 and 2 ( done using SketchUp) demonstrates that there is **no material difference in sunlight conditions** between either of the permitted development scenarios and the proposed upper storey extension. This confirms that the proposed scheme does not result in any greater impact on neighbouring amenity than development that could otherwise be implemented without planning permission.

Importantly, while sunlight effects are comparable, the proposed upper storey extension represents a **visually superior and less bulky solution**. Both PD scenarios would introduce a more prominent rear dormer and, in the case of PD Option 1, a substantial gable flank wall that would be more visually intrusive when viewed from neighbouring properties. This is illustrated in View 01 in the Visual Impact Study

By contrast, the proposed upper storey has been carefully designed with controlled massing, reduced eaves height, and a cohesive roof form, resulting in development that is both **more attractive** and **less imposing** to neighbouring occupiers while delivering equivalent amenity outcomes.

Please note that both Comparative Study Documents and Visual Impact Study was done by the architect only using skethup models and submitted for PrePlanning . The same is attached here and hence the hipped roof still has a tiny crown element .

---

## 7E. Garden Room / Studio at Rear of Garden

The proposal also includes the erection of a garden room located at the foot of the garden. As shown in the images of the site, there is an existing plinth base on site, constructed by a previous owner, upon which the new garden studio is to be erected. The proposal therefore makes use of an established base rather than introducing new ground disturbance or built form in this part of the garden.

The garden room is positioned with a minimum separation distance of approximately **2.0 metres from three boundary edges**, ensuring that it is comfortably sited within the plot and avoids any sense of enclosure or dominance when viewed from neighbouring properties.

The structure has been designed in line with **permitted development guidelines**, with an eaves height limited to **2.5 metres** and a maximum ridge height of **3.8 metres**. This restrained height and scale ensure that the garden room remains a subordinate ancillary structure, clearly secondary to the main dwelling.

There are no trees within this area of the garden that would be affected by the development, and the proposal does not result in the loss of landscaping or ecological features. Given its location, scale, and separation from boundaries, the garden room will not result in any material harm to neighbouring amenity, privacy, or outlook.

---

## 8. Planning Balance

When assessed in the planning balance, the proposal delivers clear benefits with no identified adverse impacts. The development aligns the application property with the established two-storey character of the immediate streetscape, improves visual coherence, and provides enhanced residential accommodation without harming neighbouring amenity. As demonstrated by the BRE-compliant sunlight and daylight assessment (Section 7C), the proposal has no impact on the neighbouring properties.

Any perceived increase in height is further mitigated by the site's deeper setback from the street relative to No. 156 and by the deliberately minimised eaves height, which together reduce visual prominence from the public realm. There is no material harm to character, appearance, privacy, daylight, or outlook, and the proposal represents an appropriate and proportionate form of development within the urban area.

---

## 9. Policy Compliance (Hillingdon Local Plan)

The proposal has been assessed against the relevant policies of the Hillingdon Local Plan (Part 1 and Part 2). A summary of compliance is set out below.

Policy	Requirement	Compliance Response
<b>Policy BE1 – Built Environment</b>	Development should maintain and enhance the quality of the built environment and respond to local character	a sympathetic pitched roof form, and improves streetscape coherence. Height and massing are
<b>Policy BE13 – Layouts and Design of New Buildings</b>	Development should be of an appropriate scale, massing, and height	The proposal reflects the established two-storey context, uses comparable to adjoining two-storey dwellings; the deeper setback and reduced eaves height further mitigate perceived scale.
<b>Policy BE14 – Design of New Residential Development</b>	Development should respect the character of the area and integrate with surrounding buildings	The proposal aligns No. 154 with neighbouring properties and avoids visual dominance or incongruity.
<b>Policy BE15 – Amenity</b>	Development should not result in unacceptable loss of privacy, outlook, or daylight	Window placement, roof form, and scale ensure no unacceptable impacts on neighbouring amenity.
<b>Policy DMHB 11 – Design of New Development</b>	Proposals should harmonise with local character while allowing appropriate evolution	The scheme represents a proportionate evolution of the dwelling that reinforces the prevailing two-storey pattern along Eastcote Road.

## 10) PRE PLANNING COMMENTS

We are encouraged by the Council’s confirmation that the principle of the proposed development, including the addition of a first floor and a rear garden outbuilding, is acceptable in this location.

We have taken the comments and have worked on them –

ROOF FORM – replaced the crown roof with a traditional hipped roof with a higher ridge line

FRONT ELEVATION - The front elevation has been carefully considered to establish a coherent architectural relationship between the projecting gable and the bay window below. This formal composition draws on the language of the neighbouring properties, ensuring the proposal sits comfortably within the established character of the streetscene.

To arrive at the submitted design, a number of elevation options were developed and evaluated. Refer to the accompanying document, Front Elevation: Design Development, for reference, each tested against the contextual grain of the street and the logic of the dwelling. The final submitted scheme represents the most resolved outcome of this iterative design process.

FENESTRATION - The fenestration strategy is revised to ensure a more regular and traditional arrangement, reflecting the proportions and rhythm of surrounding properties. The use of overly modern or industrial-style glazing is omitted. The existing windows have Georgian bars and the proposed will follow the same style.

MATERIALS - We acknowledge the concerns raised and have revised the proposed palette to better reflect the established character of the area. This includes the use of traditional red roof tiles and a more consistent material treatment across the façade.

ROOFLIGHT - We also confirm that the proposed front rooflight is removed, as advised.

OUTBUILDING - In response to the Planning Officer's concern regarding the overall height of the proposed garden outbuilding, we wish to clarify that the stated height of 4m is measured from existing ground level and is inclusive of the existing plinth. Given the 2m setback maintained from the neighbouring boundary fences, the proposal falls within the Permitted Development rights applicable to a structure of this type, which permit a ridge height of up to 4m.

Notwithstanding this, and in a spirit of cooperation with the Planning Authority, the ridge height has been reduced to 3.8m in the revised drawings submitted herewith.

## Conclusion

The proposed upper storey extension at 154 Eastcote Road is a well-considered and policy-compliant form of development. It responds directly to the established character of the street, where two-storey dwellings are prevalent on both sides of the site, and it has been carefully designed to remain visually subordinate through controlled height, a traditional hipped roof, reduced eaves, and a deeper setback from the highway.

The BRE-compliant sunlight assessment confirms that there is no impact on the neighbouring properties.

Importantly, when compared with a realistic permitted development fallback scenario involving a hip-to-gable conversion with a rear dormer, the proposed scheme results in no greater impact on sunlight or amenity. The fallback would, however, introduce a larger and more visually intrusive gable flank wall and dormer structure.

In this context, the proposed upper storey represents a visually superior, less bulky, and more neighbourly solution that delivers equivalent amenity outcomes to development that could otherwise be carried out. There is no demonstrable planning harm, and the proposal accords with the Hillingdon Local Plan and national planning objectives. Planning permission should therefore be granted.