

Design Access Statement

Proposed Scheme

The application seeks planning permission for a part double, part single-storey rear extension to 60 Dellfield Crescent, Uxbridge, UB8 2EU.

Site and Locality

The application relates to a two storey, three-bedroom, semi-detached dwelling, located to the east of Dellfield Crescent with the principal elevation facing south-west. The property is situated on a corner plot, benefitting from a large, north-east facing, rear garden which provides the private amenity space for the occupiers of the property and the shared driveway provides off street parking. The street scene is residential in character and appearance comprising predominantly of two storey semi-detached properties. The site does not fall within a Conservation Area, nor an Area of Special Local Character.

The single storey rear extension element would extend into the rear garden by 5 meters. It is noted that the proposed single storey rear extension would not be policy compliant. However, there are mitigating circumstances in this instance. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed extension would not impact upon the visual amenity of the street scene and therefore a reason for refusal would be difficult to justify on design grounds alone.

The adjoining neighbours at 58 Dellfield Crescent (Ref: 10343/APP/2016/806) and 62 Dellfield Crescent, are already extended 3.6 – 3.7m deep. Notably, similar sized extensions to the proposed application, are not uncommon within the area. Examples of properties in the same road are listed below:

- 22 Dellfield Crescent (Ref: 18619/APP/2020/1631)
- 51 Dellfield Crescent (Ref: 65823/APP/2014/1265)
- 50 Dellfield Crescent (Ref: 77233/APP/2022/1699)
- 48 Dellfield Crescent

Further properties in close proximity: including 19 Clammas Way and 30 Clammas Way, are also extended to the rear at similar depths.

The part first-storey rear extension element would be policy compliant and it should also be noted that three nearby properties within Dellfield Crescent have previously been granted permission for extensions of a similar scale and design to the proposed first-storey extension element of the proposed development;

- 50 Dellfield Crescent (Ref: 77233/APP/2022/1699)
- 55 Dellfield Crescent (Ref: 70025/APP/2020/4120)
- 52 Dellfield Crescent (Ref: 4069/APP/2016/1986).



Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed first floor rear extension would not impact upon the visual amenity of the street scene and therefore a reason for refusal would be difficult to justify on design grounds alone.

Taking into consideration the position of the property on a large corner plot allowing for greater separation between adjoining and rear neighbours, the fact that the rear garden is north-east facing, the adjoining neighbour's existing rear extensions and precedence of similar sized extensions in the area, the proposed extensions would not be overbearing and would not result in a loss of light or loss of privacy for adjoining residential properties. Therefore, the application proposal would not constitute an un-neighbourly form of development and would be in compliance with Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1 of the Development Management Policies (2020).

It is considered, that all the proposed habitable rooms, and those altered by the development would still maintain an adequate outlook and source of natural light, therefore complying with Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016).

Policy DMHB 18 of the Development Management Policies (2020) expects a minimum 60sq.m of private amenity space to be retained for a two and three bedrooomed property. The proposal would exceed this requirement, in compliance with the policy requirements.

The parking provision would remain unaffected by the proposal.

Pre application details below, which was done on the 3rd of may 2022.

Sunny,

Thank you for your e-mail and photos.

I can't see too many issues with a 5m (d) single storey rear element and 3.6m (d) first floor rear element in terms of neighbour amenity impact issues and it will all hinge on design, and the degree of subordination type arguments. Personally, I think we might be struggling on appeal to defend the refusal of a 5m single storey rear element given what is next door and the size of the plot-but, hopefully, it won't come to that.

I would certainly attach the research you have done with any submission.

Please note that the comments made in this email represent officer opinion and cannot be seen to prejudice the Local Planning Authority's formal determination in relation to any application or planning matter.

Regards

Richard Buxton

BA (Hons) Dip TP

Planning Information Officer
Planning

Residents Services

Location, Civic Centre
London Borough of Hillingdon

01895 250230

rbuxton@hillingsdon.gov.uk

The conclusion of the preapp, was positive since then many others have extended in the same manor on our road.

Conclusion

Decision to grant planning permission should be given having regard to all relevant planning legislation, regulations, guidance, circulars and Council policies, including The Human Rights Act (1998) (HRA 1998) which makes it unlawful for the Council to act incompatibly with Convention rights, specifically Article 6 (right to a fair hearing); Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life); Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) and Article 14 (prohibition of discrimination).